

THE AMERICAN I M A G O

Volume 2

December 1941

No. 4

Social Science
Library

BF

173

.A2

A33

V. 2

No. 4

*A Psychoanalytic Journal
for the Arts and Sciences*

Publisher and Managing Editor: Dr. Hanns Sachs, Boston

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

T
I

THE AMERICAN I M A G O

*A Psychoanalytic Journal
for the Arts and Sciences*

Publisher and Managing Editor: Dr. Hanns Sachs, Boston

Social Science

BF

173

A2

A33

v. 2

no. 4

A NOTE ON THE MEDUSA SYMBOLISM

By ISADOR H. CORIAT, M. D. (Boston, Mass.)

"Let Medusa come, that we may change him into stone."

Inferno IX, 52.

This note on the reconstruction of the symbolism of the Medusa myth was suggested by material which appeared in the course of routine analytic work. The unexpected emergence of this material led to an investigation of the literature on the subject and to considerations on the unconscious significance of the Medusa story both in mythology and in the individual.

A young man with a schizoid obsessional neurosis, while under analysis related that for years he had had recurrent fantasies of seeing his mother naked and her genitalia and pubic hair were very prominent. In the midst of this fantasy he would experience a feeling that he was compulsively gazing at his mother and during this time, too, he fantasied that his body became rigid and immovable. The affective reaction associated with this fantasy consisted of a mixture of love, disgust and hate.

Briefly, the analysis had demonstrated a strong Oedipus fixation, frequent expressions of hate and hostility towards his father, occasional castration dreams in which he seemed to be blind or having his arms amputated, feelings of narcissistic omnipotence with world destruction fantasies strongly resembling the Schreber case and a tendency to devalue women. A long period of negative transference was finally overcome.

This type of fantasy, which resembles a definite mythological picture, namely the symbolism of the head of the Medusa and the reaction which results from gazing at it, has attracted the attention not only of analysts but also of writers on Greek mythology (Ferenczi, Freud, Jones, Fluegel, Richard Payne Knight). A review of the literature on the subject together with an analytic reconstruction of the fantasy as it emerged in this particular case may serve to illuminate a rather important aspect of unconscious symbolism.

According to Ferenczi,¹ the head of the Medusa is a terrible symbol of the female genital region displaced from below upwards. The snakes on the head, through representation by the opposite, signify the absence of the penis and the terrible fear is the impression made by the castrated genital.

Richard Payne Knight² refers to the Medusa's head as symbolic of female generative or reproductive power. It has a double significance of destruction and reproduction.

Jones³ believes that the Medusa is both a phallic and a faecal fertilizing condensation and as such is utilized for reinforcement.

In a discussion of polyphallic symbolism and the castration complex, Fluegel⁴ refers to a connection between the head of the Medusa and the castration complex, the particular aspect of the latter being connected with the absence of the penis in the female. The Medusa's head, therefore, is interpreted (as Ferenczi had previously done) as a symbolic representation of the external female genitals by displacement from below upwards, that is, absence of the penis is referred to the head instead of the genital region. However, it appears, according to this paper, that the snaky hair of the Medusa is not only a castration symbol but may also be a reinforcement through giving the woman a penis by means of this polyphallic representation.

In an early paper by Freud⁵ on the infantile genital organization of the libido, it is pointed out that the devaluation of women is derived from a conviction that women lack a penis. The mythological symbol of the head of the Medusa can be traced back to this devaluation and loathing, that is, the impression made by the female genitals devoid of a penis. Freud refers to Ferenczi's paper on the subject and in a footnote emphasizes that in the myth it is the genital of the mother that is represented. He also adds

1. *S. Ferenczi* — On the Symbolism of the Head of the Medusa. Further Contributions to the Theory and Technique of Psychoanalysis, London, 1926.

2. *Richard Payne Knight* — The Symbolical Language of Ancient Art and Mythology, New York, 1876.

—Two Essays on the Worship of Priapus, London, 1865.

3. *Ernest Jones* — On the Night Mare, London, 1931.

4. *J. C. Fluegel* — Polyphallic Symbolism and the Castration Complex, Int. J. Psychoanalysis, V. 2, 1924.

5. *S. Freud* — The Infantile Genital Organization of the Libido. Coll. Papers, Vol. II, London, 1924.

that Athena, who carries the head of the Medusa on her armor, becomes by virtue of it the unapproachable woman at the sight of whom all sexual desire is stifled.

Later Freud⁶ returned to the theme of the Medusa symbolism, which he then considerably elaborated, pointing out that the fear of the Medusa is the fear of castration; that analysis has shown that this castration fear comes when the boy, who had hitherto not believed in the threat of castration, catches a glimpse of his mother's genitals; that the hair of the Medusa's head, in the form of serpents, reactivates the castration complex; and that so great is the horror aroused that the penis is replaced polyphallically as a reinforcement. Furthermore he states that the stiffening with fear at the sight of the Medusa's head, turning the beholder into stone, is equivalent to an erection, a reassurance that the beholder has a penis, a form of defiance against the castrated woman.

Among the homosexual ancient Greeks, masculine love was idealized and the devaluation of woman found symbolic expression in the Medusa myth.

The snakes on the Medusa's head have a double meaning: they are polyphallic symbols which neutralize the castration fantasy, and also representative of the female genitalia. This symbolism is the same as the hallucinations of snakes in delirium tremens, as many chronic alcoholics, because of their latent homosexuality, are sexually impotent.

In the fragment of analytic material under discussion, with particular reference to the recurrent fantasy, it will be necessary to consider several questions. The fantasied rigidity and immobility of the body when the patient looked at his mother's genitalia is the same as the Greek horror myth of being turned to stone when gazing at the Medusa's head. This transformation of the entire body to stone is the symbolic equivalent of the body becoming an erect phallus, but, in this case, a stone phallus, which is identical with impotence and castration. It is a form of punishment for the forbidden incest wish arising out of the intensity of the Oedipus complex and not, as is usually assumed, a reinforcement of masculinity.

6. S. Freud — *Das Medusenhaupt* - *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. XVII - *Schriften aus dem Nachlass* - London, 1941.

This symbolism of the body as a phallus has been emphasized by Lewin⁷ who points out that in the manifest content of a dream the penis may be represented by the dreamer's own body. In other words, the body has become genitalized.

The decapitation of the Medusa by Perseus is castration carried out on the mother in order to make her a female and Perseus himself is the son who through the decapitation makes his mother a real woman, thus eliminating her as a phallic female. In the Medusa story there are not only scopophilic elements but also the castration and Oedipus complexes, all of which belong to the phallic stage of libido development.

In the patient, the curiosity about his mother's genitals sets up a severe super ego punishment in order to neutralize the incestuous Oedipus wishes. Therefore he was horrified, there developed a fantasy of the body becoming rigid and immobile, literally turned to stone (castration impotence) in order to make the Oedipal incestuous act impossible. His Oedipus complex, with its incestuous desires has succumbed to castration punishment; the super-ego has rendered the body rigid, immobile, a genuine castration.

This reaction is the impotence of fear, a protection against incest, a form of punishment for forbidden incestuous wishes. The fantasied rigidity of the body is, therefore, a form of impotence which is equivalent to castration, and this castration is punishment for incestuous desires.

In his reaction to the female genitalia, the mother is not only given a penis or many penises, as claimed by some writers who emphasize the polyphallic symbolism of the hair of the Medusa, but at the same time, there is an opposite representation, an actual deprivation of a penis. In gazing at his mother, he thinks that he becomes rigid and immobile, a genuine castration punishment. This is a form of resistance against the Oedipus complex, rendering the Oedipus desire of sexual union with the mother impossible. The incapacity for movement, impotence, is the result of fear. This impotent fear has a paralyzing effect; it is an inhibition against transforming an instinctual impulse into action and the symptom-formation of castration-rigidity is the result.

7. Bertram D. Lewin — The Body as Phallus, *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, II, 1, 1933.

The symbolism of the Medusa myth, like that of the Oedipus myth, has its roots deep in the unconscious; both may reappear in a disguised form in the childhood of the individual as they appeared in the childhood of the race. The fear of castration arises out of the Oedipus complex; this fear is likewise symbolically expressed in the Medusa story in the form of being turned to stone as a punishment for incestuous fantasies. Thus, in the psychic life of both the individual and the race, psychosexual fantasy structures may occur, both in the condensations and displacements of myths and likewise in the individual psychology of the structure of a neurosis.

SURREALISM AS SYMPTOM

By EFRAIM M. ROSENZWEIG (Scranton, Pa.)

The fact that an art-manifestation such as Surrealism is no longer a *cause celebre*, and, as such no longer commands public attention and interest, by no means removes it from the consideration of the student of social phenomena. One might rather say that now that the shouts and murmurs have subsided, there avails a better opportunity for the calm scrutiny of a school of art, which, the more closely it is examined, the more it gives evidence of its nature as a symptom of contemporary social trends. Considered within the framework of its genealogy, and with particular attention to the published statements of its proponents, its true significance emerges with precise clarity. Viewed in the light of the political and social developments of its generation, Surrealism offers us an unusual opportunity to perceive the meaning of seemingly unrelated fields of activity, as they become cognate by reason of the unfolding of their respective implications, whether in ideology or in activity. All this will become clear as our analysis continues.

In 1910, four years before the inception of a World War that was to have such a traumatic effect upon the contemporary mind, there was issued in Milan, Italy, the manifesto of a group of artists who called themselves the "Futurists." The sum of that manifesto is found in their exhortation to "exalt every kind of originality, of boldness, of extreme violence . . . rebel against the tyranny of the words 'Harmony' and 'Good Taste.'" It is thus apparent that already before the war there were accumulating the forces which were later to explode with violent fury during and after the post-war world, under the name of "Dadaism," and which represented within themselves a sort of temper tantrum in the grand manner; a furious, negative, nihilistic attack upon a world which had been in its *ad hoc* form responsible for the collapse of traditional values, systems and securities. Raynal, commenting on Picabia's Dadaist phase, is of the opinion that it "must be relegated therefore to the case history of an impossible revolt against a state of mind eternally governing painting; against the perennial

canons of picture making; in defiance of ideas for which we have as yet found no acceptable substitute."¹

But Dadaism was no mere "revolt against a state of mind eternally governing painting"; it was a complete abrogation, through the language of plastic art, of a world which had seemingly proven itself irrational, and which, by the fact of the long drawn out and horrible slaughter of war, had declared itself to be incompetent further to guide the destiny of man on a rational basis. In its own way, Dadaism, the work of highly intelligent and sensitive men, was the first hint of the coming "revolution of nihilism."

The writer in *Time Magazine* of December 14, 1936, who said of Dadaism, that it was "... a bewilderment that affected the art world of Europe for a few shell-shocked years during and immediately after the War" was more truly right than was Raynal, and he was, furthermore, correct in observing that "the object of Dadaism was a conscious attack on reason; a complete negation of everything; ... in moments of harmony and logic which they affect to despise, Dadaists admitted that their object was 'to spit in the eye of the world.'" And "spit in the eye of the world" they certainly did. Nothing could have been more completely contemptuous of potential meaning in creative experience than the exhibition given by Hans Arp and Morris Ernst in Cologne, 1920. The entrance to the exhibit was through a public lavatory; the gallery-goers were given hatchets to smash any pictures of which they did not approve; a young girl in white Communion dress stood on a platform and recited obscene poems ... Such were the flood waters of aggressive hatred of the world of society, of religion, of prevailing political theory, as they poured out over the earth during and after the war years.

The passion spent itself, but the fundamental motivations did not evaporate; they were only to be guided into other channels. The blind hatreds which Dadaism represented had been turned not only outward, against an irrational, hostile, disturbed world, but inward as well. To place hatchets in the hands of gallery-goers for the purpose of destroying the creative object is no more and no less than a gesture of castration. Looking about them, what could these Dadaists see? What anchoring reality? What es-

1. *Modern French Painters*, p. 135.

sential integrity upon which dependable authority could pivot? To Create means to continue purposively. But to create now? To what end? What purpose could there be in a world where old men signed away the lives and the hopes of the young?

Yes, these Dadaists' sons wished to kill the father who had subjected them to torment and to actual mutilation—had pierced their bodies with bullets and drained their hearts of hope. Those old men — the fathers — they were the world; the world had made the chaos in which the Dadaists and their generation must live. Ah, to spit in the eye of the world! Beautiful gesture of contempt! But *menschenhass* means, after all, to tilt against a ghost; it is *selbsthass* and finally *selbstmord* which brings the sweet and relieving sense of actual accomplishment. At last the bayonet finds a flesh-and-blood body. Thus man against himself; being frustrated in his hope to destroy the enemy, the abstract "Father," symbol of all that directs the destiny of one's life, he turns upon himself.

But the ego-impulse still expresses itself in the great desire for self-preservation. The suicide, the self-castration — these are only symbolical, as in the rite or ceremony. If one "reality" falls, then another must rise to take its place; the collapse of one "authority" may bring in its immediate train the inchoate bewilderments of Dadaism, but it will ultimately give way to a new projection of the many-faceted father-image. So it appears to be as we examine the art theory which superseded Dadaism: namely, Surrealism.

Sheldon Cheney remarks that "it took over the task earlier assumed by the wartime Dadaists of demolishing the pretentious principles and reputations of realists, Cezannists, Cubists and other established schools; it then set out on its own creative adventure, which is in the realm of a 'dream reality'; very intellectual, very Freudian, and in the direction of a different sort of sense realism rather than anti-realistic."² Before the precise nature of this "different sort of sense realism" can be described, it is necessary to call to the reader's attention the part that psychoanalysis played in the general theory of Surrealism.

I think it fair to state that Surrealism found in the teachings of psychoanalysis both pretext and strategy. It is said that many of the Surrealists are well versed in the findings of psychoanalytic theory. This may be so, but there is no evidence that they used

2. History of Art, p. 892.

their information with scrupulous attention to the authentic objectives of those theories: namely, the development of a technique of therapy for the neurotic—or, in minimal terms, the understanding *per se* of the “topography” and the processes of the human psyche. Rather did the Surrealists choose at will from both concept and terminology in order to reinforce with “authority” their assault upon all forms of restraint. Here was Dadaism grown to cunning maturity.

Thus André Breton felt free to write of Freud: “that which they (his discoveries) reveal to us of the nature of human relationships, threatens to destroy even those institutions hitherto considered as the most reliable, beginning with the family, and after the ruin of a derisive moral code, awakens in us the expectation of a veritable science of morality.”³ What interests us is the fact that although changes in human relationships did not wait for Sigmund Freud in order to get under way, Breton, because he wishes it to be so, argues that all that he has observed (was it all really there?) as *post hoc*, must have been *ergo propter hoc*. He wishes it to be so, because as an intellectual descendant of the Futurists, he is rebelling against a tyranny. In 1910 the Futurists could rebel against the tyranny of words; in 1920, three years after the Russian Revolution, the Surrealists think of tyranny in other contexts and connotations.

It is “Reason” itself which becomes the arch enemy. “Verbal and graphic automatism only represent a limit toward which the poet or artist should tend.” By 1936, three years after Hitler has come to power, Breton can write: “It remains to us to suppress, in the most indisputable manner, both that which oppresses us in the moral order, and that which ‘physically’ as they say, deprives us of a clear view.”⁴ If, then, by pretending that Freud has pointed out the way, automatism is to be the goal, how is this operation to be performed? Breton answers: “The secret of Surrealism lies in the fact that we are persuaded that something is hidden behind them (trees, houses, volcanoes, empires). Now one has only to examine the various methods, to perceive that only one of them remains to us, depending, in the final analysis, upon our power

3. Surrealism; ed. Read; p. 103.

4. What is Surrealism? p. 29.

of 'voluntary hallucination.'"⁵ It was the poets Lautréamont, Rimbaud and Mallarmé, says Breton, "who really caused us to make up our minds to rely for our redemption here below upon ourselves alone, so that we have desperately to pursue their footsteps, animated by that feverish desire for conquest, total conquest, that will never leave us."⁶

What then of this new "sense realism," this new order of things? What is the reconstruction of the world which fell with the debris of the war? What do the Surrealists find by turning for their salvation into themselves alone, relying upon "voluntary hallucination" to help them reach the ultimate limit of automatism?

Again Breton answers: "Since the conclusion of what one may term the purely intuitive epoch of Surrealism (1919-1925)—at the limit, I say, we have attempted to present interior reality and exterior reality as two elements in process of unification, of finally becoming *one*. This final unification is the supreme aim of Surrealism; interior reality and exterior reality being, in the present form of society, in contradiction . . . we have assigned to ourselves the task of confronting the two realities with one another on every possible occasion, and of refusing to allow the preeminence of the one over the other, and yet not acting on the one and on the other *both at once*, for that would be to suppose that they are less far apart from one another than they are; of acting upon these two realities not both at once, then, but one after another, in a systematic manner, allowing us to observe their reciprocal attraction and interpenetration and to give to this interplay of forces all the extension necessary for the trend of the two adjoining realities to become one and the same thing."⁷ The interior reality whereof Breton speaks is, of course, the full, unimpeded flow of phantasy and dream-stuff induced by "voluntary hallucination."

Such is the new reality. Thus Breton clarifies that which he wrote elsewhere: "Above all, we expressly oppose the view that it is possible to create a work or even, properly considered, any useful work, by expressing only the manifest content of an age. On the contrary, Surrealism proposes to express its latent content." Breton refuses to allow "the preeminence of the one over the other,"

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid: p. 14.

7. Ibid: p. 49, 50.

but allows himself the luxury of a contradiction when he refers to the interior reality as the "superior reality."⁸

But what is the latent content of an age? The very effort of this paper on Surrealism is to ascertain whether, by translating social or artistic phenomena into the language of psychoanalysis as it pertains to the operations of the human psyche, we can speak of an "age" as having "latent content." Evidently, the Surrealists believe that there is a latent content by which the manifest content is made comprehensible. Realizing that the manifest phenomena of our contemporary civilization imply some sort of deeply rooted "neuroses" or conflicts which may be said to be true of our world populations today, they propose to bring the unconscious into the healing light of the sun through their Surrealist technique. The Surrealist technique thereupon becomes a sort of artistic psychotherapy. But actually it becomes a technique of revelation without assurance of future adjustment for either the Surrealist or the onlooker. Aware of the higher sensibility of the artist, the Surrealist holds that the secrets of the self, which are buried in all men alike, are revealed in all their actuality only by the artist. The self, moreover, is not personal, but, made up from elements of the unconscious, reveals itself as collective — common to all men, and not to the artist alone. From this the Surrealist argues that whatever emerges in the Surrealist universe of discourse must of necessity represent not the artist's psyche alone, but the collective psyche — the so-called latent content of the age.

In their self-conscious awareness of their place as artistic counterparts of other social phenomena, the Surrealists term themselves "romantics," pointing out that "the universal truths of romanticism are coeval with the evolving consciousness of mankind."⁹ With this romanticism set in opposition to classicism, and classicism identified by them as "the intellectual counterpart of political tyranny,"¹⁰ we are better prepared to understand that Surrealism is an aspect of adolescent revolt against an anacritic love-object. Classicism has become for them the symbol of the hated mentor, the restraining hand of the past. In art it is called classicism, in politics tyranny and imperialism, in religion —

8. TIME, Dec. 14, 1936.

9. Surrealism ed. Read; p. 28.

10. Ibid, p. 23.

simply morality itself. Breaking free of this triune classicism, they appealed to Freudian psychoanalysis for an opening gambit as it were; in its disclosures they found what they felt to be sufficient cause for rebellion against all aspects of the censor's blue-pencil. But in the end the greatest contribution of psychoanalysis was to make the Surrealist effort more obvious to the analyst. Theirs was to be a new order — a new morality — even a new reality.

Again our very articulate Breton states the case for us: ". . . today, more than ever before the *liberation of the mind*, the express aim of Surrealism, demands as primary condition, in the opinion of the Surrealists, the *liberation of man*, which implies that we must struggle with our fetters with all the energy of despair; . . . today more than ever before the Surrealists entirely rely for the bringing about of the liberation of man upon the proletarian revolution."¹¹

The denunciation of Fascism by Breton, two pages prior to the above quotation, as a "disease inevitably followed by the deprivation of all rights," need not mislead us now. Futurism was the psychic forerunner of Mussolini, the man of violence; Surrealism was the psychic articulation of a collective readiness for Hitler's anti-classicist, "total conquest." Perhaps we can look upon Mussolini's Fascism as corresponding to the "purely intuitive" epoch of Surrealism (1919-1925), whereas Hitler's fascism with its own version of suppression of intellection, of the Judaeo-Christian moral tradition, and its revolution against political classicism represents the full-blown doctrine of the mature Surrealism. Hitler, too, would create a new reality; he calls it the "new order." He, too, thinks in terms of suppressing "in the most indisputable manner both that which oppresses . . . in the moral order, and that which 'physically' deprives . . . of a clear view." *Lebensraum* may be translated one way for the Surrealists, and quite another for the man of action; but there is no real difference. Hitler, too, creates his new reality by bringing into juxtaposition and allowing the interaction thereof the objective world and the new unrestrained demands of the power-seeking id.

"My whole ambition in the pictorial domain," writes Salvador Dali, most publicized of the Surrealists, "is to materialize the images of concrete irrationality with the most imperialist fury of

11. What is Surrealism, p. 49.

precision. In order that the world of the imagination and of concrete irrationality may be as objectively evident, of the same consistency, of the same durability, of the same persuasive, cognoscitive and communicable thickness as that of the exterior world of phenomenal reality."¹² Nazism has done no less with the Gestapo; it has created a world of nightmares, phantastic unbelieveables, but with "imperialist fury of precision." The tortures are orderly, the ashes are returned in neat little cigar-boxes, the *fuehrer-prinzip* holds the canvas of the escaped unconscious with iron hand.

Now, the content of a Surrealist canvas is, for all of their search after the "latent content of the age" no more than the manifest content of a dream. This they openly acknowledge when they lay claim to no clear understanding of what they have done. How then can the Surrealist canvas communicate to the spectator? Surrealism, as I have indicated, believes that because man is essentially one, all that emerges through the automatism, if such it be, of the Surrealist technique, is within the universe of discourse of every man's psyche. The fallacy of this concept lies in this fact: while the basic symbols of psychoanalysis: clocks, rooms, watches, shoes, trees, pillars, water, fish, etc., may have become sufficiently the property of some people to merit the designation of "materials of the collective unconscious," that does not mean that the statement of the manifest content of *one dream* is spokesman for all. Each Surrealist canvas is, as it were, just one person's dream-content, depending closely upon the personal experience and underlying conflicts and neuroses for immediate meaning. Dali's pictorial catharsis may have value for himself, but not necessarily for Breton, Arp, Ernst, Miro or anyone else.

There is, therefore, no communication save for this possibility: in the presence of some of the Surrealist canvases disquietude may be felt by the spectator — and this disquietude may conceivably be based upon the *unconscious* response to the symbols, images and significations of the canvas. But that recognition, as we recognize from the tension and anxiety, is held in dark restraint within the confines of the unconscious, and has not yet been clarified by the precipitate of conscious understanding. If the Surrealist himself must await the clarification which understanding of the

12. Conquest of the Irrational, p. 12.

latent content will bring, how much more is this true of the onlooker who is one step removed from conscious understanding of even the *manifest* content? The true completion of a Surrealist canvas awaits its final explanation through whatever techniques psychoanalysts would most readily approve.

The Surrealist started out to depict the "latent content of the age"; he has in every instance failed to depict the latent content of even his own phantasies as concretized pictorially since disclosure of latent content depends upon interpretation. But in one thing Surrealism did not fail: namely, in bringing meaning through its very existence as a body of theory.

I think it can most justly be said that it is not the form of individual Surrealist canvases—or Surrealist poems and other art phenomena—that is revealing, but, rather, the very fact of Surrealism itself. It discloses itself as manifesto of revolt—revolt against all strictures which have thus far been sacred to our Western civilization, and thus is allied to the revolutionary movements which have in that same civilization undertaken to destroy the moral, economic, political configurations which, since the emergence of what could be called a Western civilization, have been identified with that civilization. It would be much too long, and would require a veritable volume of proof, to show how the authority of our Western civilization developed, but of one thing we can be quite certain: that one social phenomenon after another in our own day has disavowed that authority. Among them is Surrealism; among them is also Nazism—but it is an *also par excellence*!

I have called this study "Surrealism as Symptom." I have tried to suggest that while Dadaism, its predecessor, was an ill-tempered, punishing outburst, reflecting the diffuse negativism of the war and post-war years, Surrealism became a more mature, "planned cunning" however unconscious as cunning. Surrealism is to Dadaism and all other rejectional isms what Hitlerism in office and power is to Hitlerism in the formative years. We saw how both Surrealism and Nazism hold in contempt the rational restraints, classicism, traditional authority. Both are the twin children of the profound contemporary rebellion against the strictures and restraints which Western civilization imposes upon its populations. Both are important as phenomena because each

brings the revolt into vivid and undisguised definition. Both deal in violence—one in image and the other in actuality; both extol the hitherto disciplined pleasure impulses of man. It does not matter that Nazism has repudiated Surrealism together with other modern art forms, as "cultural Bolshevism." The paradox is no paradox to those who understand the processes of projection. Cultural Bolshevism, the phrase by which Hitler describes all art of revolution and rebellion against authoritative canons and traditions, is only the counterpart of his own subconscious motivations and intentions. It is the projection of the evil he will not see in himself; it is the devil to the devil who would be God. The mirror must be shattered because it is too faithful.

Surrealism as symptom—of what? Of the great contemporary rebellion. It is the rebellion of the sons against the father; the id against the super-ego; the determination to eschew—indeed to destroy—all restraints, all moral fetters. Reason, super-ego, reality-principle—these must go to be replaced by a "new science of morality," the "proletarian revolution," the clearing away of all that obscures the view. If the "principle" in the reality-principle cannot be altered, then the reality must be.

Somewhere, deep in the psyche of modern man, the id stands always ready for the day of conquest. When at last, as the great traditions of authority—social counterparts of the father-image—become so weakened (by factors which cannot here be examined) that it is felt the time is at hand for the overthrow of that authority, then the more articulate individuals form their groups—political and artistic, social, economic, religious—and gird for battle. But the "sons" must one day themselves become the "fathers." Then what? All this belongs to an emerging philosophy of history, insights into which are provided us by our growing understanding of the bridge which straddles the individual ego and that ego as it manifests itself in all forms of collective behavior.

THE BLESSING OF THE KOHENITES*

By DR. SANDOR FELDMAN (New York)

Freud, in his "The Case History of an Infantile Neurosis," says that "We bring with us phylogenetic patterns that, like some philosophical 'categories,' receive the life-impressions. . . . They are deposits from the civilized history of humanity. The Oedipus Complex that contains the child's relationships to his parents belongs to them. . . . If the impressions don't fit into the hereditary patterns, phantasy does them over again. . . . Just such cases prove the independent existence of the patterns. We can observe that pattern wins over experience."

Needless to say, not only the Oedipus Complex belongs to the patterns mentioned by Freud. As I see it, these phylogenetic patterns play a great part in group-psychology, and without them we can hardly get on in the psychology of a people. In the life of the individual, as Freud says, the life-impressions don't occur according to pattern. My investigations resulted in the recognition that the individual, when in the group, returns to the phylogenetic patterns. In this lies the strength of the customs, rites, and ceremonies. Path-finding analysts, Freud, and after him especially Reik, Roheim, and others, have given us the methods with which to work profitably in the hard and delicate field of folk-psychology. We must rest content that the investigation here is not so sure as in the analysis of an individual. But if we do it with due caution, the probability of the correctness of our findings may be accepted.

I applied the following method: A. I thoroughly searched the whole history of the object of my investigation. I examined what it is today and what it was at the beginning. B. I endeavored to find out the mental attitude towards the rite of those who have preserved and practiced it throughout the ages, and C. what effect the rite had on those who believed in it. D. I sought parallels to the rite in other ethnological fields. In A, B, and D, the investigations

*Read in Budapest before the Hungarian Psychoanalytical Association, Oct. 21, 1939.

brought satisfactory results, not so in C. This has a reason of its own, and it is this, in my opinion: The rite belongs to a very deep and remote phylogenetic pattern to which the individual added very little. It is, therefore, very difficult to learn from the analysis of an individual what he feels when, as a member of the group, he conforms to the rite.

Children raised in a religious atmosphere make their own religious rites and ceremonies in the time when they need them most for the solution of their conflict; they abandon them when they can substitute them with other individual, neurotic means.

One of my patients, about ten years old, observed for two years most punctiliously and without any compulsion the strict Jewish dietary laws. He did it more rigorously than his environment because he needed them for the prevention of his incest-urges. He gave them up at the age of twelve when he got himself another mode of prevention. So, e.g., he developed an extreme nausea bordering on fright, especially at meals, of the saliva of the mother and the others in the house.

Another patient of mine, in about her sixth year, began to observe most minutely all religious ceremonies. Frequent spyings at her parents' coitus engendered various conflicts in her, that she tried to assuage by ritual observances. Later, when she developed different compulsion-neurotic symptoms, she abandoned them and lapsed into painful compulsory doubts and hesitations.

Freud sees similarity between religious ritualism and compulsion-neurosis. I see that the difference between the two is equally essential. A neurosis is the product of the individual himself. Religious observances seem to be imposed on man who, inclined to neurosis, escapes into religion when he is in need of it. He will give it up when he has found a substitute for it. He will repeatedly resort to it whenever he needs it again.

The normal man becomes religious according to the categories postulated by Freud of which he is not conscious. The neurotic, as a rule, can give reasons for his religiousness. Who is not neurotic has no reasons.

I chose for my object of investigation a rite of the synagogue that I experienced myself and by which I was deeply moved for a number of years. To refresh my memory of it, I visited an orthodox synagogue where they avidly preserve the old traditions and

could rest assured that they observe the rite as it was done many centuries ago.

The rite is called "The Raising up of Hands" (Nesiath Kapayim) or "The Blessing of the Priests" (Birchath Kohanim). Its popular name is Duchan (Platform). It is done by the Kohenites, i.e., the reputed descendants of Aaron who, in the biblical narrative, is the high priest of the Hebrew tribes in the desert and a brother of Moses. The rite is traced back to the passage of Numbers vi. 22-27: "And the Lord spoke unto Moses, saying: Speak unto Aaron and unto his sons, saying: On this wise ye shall bless the children of Israel; ye shall say unto them: The Lord bless thee, and keep thee; the Lord make His face to shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee; the Lord lift up His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace. So shall they put My name upon the children of Israel, and I will bless them." The Kohenites stand up before the Ark, that, as a rule, is a platform (duchan) to which a few steps lead up, and which is the holiest place in the synagogue, and pronounce the blessing in a peculiar manner. The rite is done on all the festivals towards the end of the additional morning service (musaph). If the festival falls on a Sabbath, the rite is omitted, with the exception of the Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur) which is stronger than the Sabbath. But there are places when the rite is done even if a festival falls on a Sabbath. For long, in antiquity, the rite was performed daily and at every service. According to tradition (Tamid, v. 1), in the temple of Jerusalem the priests (kohanim) spoke the words of the blessing after the daily burnt-offering.

The minutiae of the rite are prescribed in the ritual code Shulchan Aruch Orach Chaim (128). Before the blessing the kohen must not drink wine or any other intoxicating beverage. Before he mounts the platform he shall wash his hands to the bones that connect them with the arm. It is thus that the priests did in the sanctuary of yore. For this ablution no benediction is required, because the kohen washed already in the morning and pronounced the benediction.

The washing in the morning is, for all Jews, the most precisely prescribed in the same code: "He shall lift up the vessel with the right hand and then put it into his left. First he must pour water on his right hand, then take the vessel in his right hand and pour on

the left. He must do so three times alternating the hands. The water must reach the joint, in emergency to the end of the fingers. After the hands he must wash his face in honor of his Creator who, according to the Torah, made man in His image. He then rinses his mouth on account of the saliva accumulated therein for the name of God must be pronounced in purity and sanctity. The water poured from a vessel must fall into a vessel. . . . The water of washing must not be used for any other purpose, for it became the water of the spirit of uncleanness. Before the washing he shall not touch with his hand his mouth, or his nose, or his eyes, or his ears, or any other opening. . . . Great care must be taken that the water come from a vessel drawn by human power. But in emergency . . . any fluid is permissible, even if it does not get on the hand by human act. The following must wash their hands: He who got up from bed, or comes from the lavatory or bath, or pared his nails, or had his hair cut, he who took off his shoes . . . cohabited sexually, cleaned his clothes, touched vermin, combed, touched covered parts of his body, came from the cemetery or from accompanying the dead to it. Lastly, one who let his blood."

Some of the precepts of the ablution of hands before meals, (if bread is eaten at it) are as follows: "All things must be removed from the hands that would not let water penetrate to his skin. One who has long nails must remove all dirt under them. Similarly, one must remove the rings, lest they be an obstacle to the water." On the hand of the Kohenite, before the rite of the blessing, the Levite pours the water. In the absence of Levites, the firstborn, "the opener of the womb," may do it. No one of the other Israelites may do it. Rather the Kohen shall do it himself, if a Levite or a firstborn is not present. "It is forbidden to the Kohen to mount the platform in shoes. He must remove them before the ablution."

The act is performed in the following way: "The cantor calls aloud, "Kohenites," whereupon they, standing before the Holy Ark and facing it, pull their prayer-shawls (talith) over their heads, under which they stretch out their hands horizontally with the height of their shoulders, or a little above their head. The digits of the hands must be so arranged as to form five empty spaces. A space between the little and ring fingers and the middle and fore fingers; another one between the latter and the thumb; two other

ones in the same way on the second hand. A fifth space is formed by bringing the two thumbs close to each other. There must be five spaces, as it is written: "Metzitz min ha'kerakim" ("He peereth through the lattice." Cant. ii. 9). The numerical value of the Hebrew letter "h" that stands before "kerakim," is five.¹ In such a position the Kohenites repeat after the cantor every word of the blessing. I quote the whole verse of Canticles: "Hark! my beloved! behold, he cometh, leaping upon the mountains, skipping upon the hills. My beloved is like a gazelle or a young hart; behold, he standeth behind our wall, he looketh in through the windows, he peereth through the lattice."

"While the Kohenites bless the people they shall not look in any direction around them, that they shall divert not their attention from the blessing. They shall turn their gaze downwards. . . . The people shall hearken to the blessing with devotion, with their face turned towards the Kohenites. But they shall not look at the Kohenites, and the latter shall not look at their hands. The people also take the prayer-shawl over their face, that they look not there."

When the service approaches the rite of the blessing, commotion and excitement are noticeable in the worshippers. The Kohenites step out from their pews; they are in stockings, some also in slippers. They go through the ablution, and show that they are conscious of the solemnity and importance of their task. When I last saw the rite performed, the group of Kohenites consisted of three plain men, a private in the army, and a boy of fourteen. They didn't pay the slightest attention to the people. In such a great moment there exists no acquaintance, friend or relative. They are now Kohenites who at this moment stand far above the rabbi, even above the rich Jews in the front pews. They ascend the platform and face the ark, and are soon wrapt in devout prayers prescribed to be said before the blessing. When the cantor exclaims: "Kohenim," they quickly turn to the public. One can see on the latter fear and utter devotion; many are all-covered with the prayer-shawls; others look aside, lest they be tempted to look at the

1. The Hebrew letter "h" has a great mystic meaning in Judaism. The four lettered name of God is Yahweh (YHWH). The name was originally Yahu (YHU), to which a second H was added. Abraham's name was changed from Abram to Abraham, Saray's to Sarah, Joshua to Jehoshua. In a few places in the Bible Jehoseph occurs instead of Joseph, etc.

Kohenites. On the right side of the platform stands the desk of the cantor, flanked by a number of singers of different ages, who are the closest to the Kohenim. They must be the most cautious not to look. They huddle together and look to the floor or aside. Two small boys stood before the platform. They were deeply touched, they gaped at the scene with open mouths and big eyes. After the blessing both the Kohenim and the people seem at rest; peace, joy, and satisfaction are reflected on their faces. The latter loudly and ostentatiously thank the former for the benefit bestowed upon them. With this the rite is concluded.

We cannot get a sufficient understanding of the rite, unless we consider some particulars of it not mentioned in Scriptures.

In the temple of Jerusalem the Kohenites blessed the people every day, after the sacrifice of daily offering (*tamid*), from a platform in the hall of priests. This was an essential part of the service and concluded it. It is surprising that the priests were permitted to mount the platform on steps, as it is said to them: "Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto Mine altar, that thy nakedness be not uncovered thereon" (Gen. Ex. xx. 23). According to the commentators, the priest had to wear trousers while at the service, that his sex organ be covered. He had also to wear a girdle, that his heart see not his shame. The *chassidim* (pious) still use a girdle at the service, many do so the whole day. The idea is that the body consists of two parts: a pure upper one and a carnal lower one. A patient of mine suffering from claustrophobia was afraid that the buttons of his shorts might fall off and his pants slip down, and then. . . . To prevent the disaster, he fastened it to his shirt with a safety pin, or tied it with a cord to his body. He had a castration fear.

Before entering the sanctuary (Lev. x.8), the priests were forbidden to take wine and strong drinks. Also today the Kohenites must not partake of any intoxicating fluid before the rite of the blessing. Frieda From-Reichmann pointed out that in the dietary ritual wine is a substitute for blood. The obsessional neurotic rite of ablution of hands, the prohibition of drinking of blood suggest a defence against murderous and cannibalistic urges, in short, against the temptation of the primal act. It is a defense against the wish to kill the father and eat him. It is enjoined that the hands of the Kohen must be clean when the water is poured on them by

a human act. It is to prevent self-deception that obsessional neurotics often do so. Let us not forget that the rite is performed before the Ark. There the Kohenites stand with their backs to the Ark and facing the public. It is significant that at the ablation only a Levite who is inferior to the Kohen, may assist. The Kohen may do it himself, or a firstborn, "the opener of the womb."

The Kohen is the representative of God. He is that, among others, in the rite of the redemption of the firstborn (Numbers xviii. 14). Every "opener of the womb" belongs to God (Ex. xiii. 2), but he can be redeemed from a Kohen for five shekels. At the conclusion of the rite the Kohen pronounces the priestly blessing. In another Pentateuchal passage (Numbers iv. 13) it is said that the Levites are given to God and belong to Aaron and his sons. If the firstborn is the first only of the father, but he is not an "opener of the womb," no redemption is needed. The "opener of the womb" commits incest. He would also kill the father, as in the primal horde the firstborn must have been the ringleader in the doing away with the great father.

With the ablation the Kohen admits the primal sin and guards himself against its repetition. At the rite of the blessing the congregation identify themselves with the Kohenites who equally are of the people. No man was permitted to step on the threshold of the temple. It was the duty of the Kohenite keepers to prevent this. The taboo is sufficiently cleared up in two papers by Reik and Roheim. The latter proves that to tread on the threshold signifies a hostile intention against the master of the house and the wish to make the mistress of the house his own, sexually. According to Reik, it would indicate disrespect to the owner of the house by a displacement to the smallest. A survival of the keepers of the threshold might be the doorman before the mansions, of the noble, the human and animal figures above gates, the cherubs of the Garden of Eden, and above the Ark in many a synagogue, the inscription on the door-post of the Jewish homes (mezuzah), the sphinxes, etc. The biblical book of Esther tells that when Esther wanted to approach the king in the interest of her people, she was afraid that the guard might kill her if she entered the king's room without being called by him, unless he held out to her his sceptre. This he fortunately did.

The injunction of taking off the shoes takes us further. It is prescribed as follows: "The Kohen is prohibited to go up with shoes to the platform where the blessing takes place. He must remove his shoes before the ablution of the hands. He must be careful that he put the shoes under the pew, that they be not seen. Consideration for the public demands this." Such is the rationalization of the theological commentators of tradition. To remove the shoes is a very ancient custom. Dr. G. Deutsch quotes the Talmud (Rosh Hashanah 31b), according to which the obligation of the Kohen to remove the shoes before the blessing, remained in force after the destruction of the temple. No man was permitted to enter the temple with shoes. This was not extended to the synagogues. Till the present day a Jew is forbidden to wear shoes on the Day of Atonement, on the ninth of Ab, that is the traditional day of the destruction of the two temples, during the seven days of mourning (shivah), and on the seventh day of Tabernacles (Hoshanah Rabbah) at the morning service of the synagogue: Footwear not made of leather has not been tabooed by Judaism.

A commentator of the Shulchan Aruch says, that the reason for the prohibition of wearing shoes at the rite of the blessing is that the shoelaces might get loose, in which case the Kohen might be so busy with tying them again as to miss the rite, or a part of it. The general opinion of the Jews is, that the removal of the shoes is a sign of respect for the place. The analytical investigation of the custom tells us something different and much more. Analysts have tackled the theme already. The investigation of shoe-fetishism enriched our knowledge in this matter with valuable material.

In the story of the thornbush God says to Moses: "Take off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground" (Ex. iii. 5). The same words Joshua heard when, after the crossing of the Jordan, he circumcised the Israelites with knives of flint at the "hill of prepuces" (Joshua v.). From the occurrence of the two incidents, circumcision and the taking off the shoes, in the same passage, we may conclude that they stand in close relation to each other. It is the acceptance of castration in order to demonstrate the giving up of incest. Deutsch draws attention to an ancient Israelitish custom recorded in the book

of Ruth (ch. v.): "Now this was the custom in former time in Israel concerning redeeming and concerning exchanging, to confirm all things: a man drew off his shoes and gave it to his neighbor; and this was the attestation in Israel" (v. 7).

Another ancient rite still practiced in Judaism, that of chalitzah proves the castration-meaning of the removal of the shoes. The chalitzah rite is enjoined in Deuteronomy (xxv. 5), and is to absolve the elder brother, and also the other brothers, from marrying the wife of a brother who had died without an issue. "His brother's wife shall draw nigh unto him in presence of the elders and loose his shoe from off his foot and spit in his face and she shall answer and say: 'So shall it be done unto the man who doth not build up his brothers' House.' And his name shall be called in Israel The house of him that had his shoe loosed." Onan, though he performed the levirate marriage, had to die, because he spilled the sperma on the ground and didn't want to build up his brother's house (Gen. xxxviii. 8). In the rite as it is done today a peculiar shoe is employed. The brother and the woman do as prescribed in the Bible.

Levy made the chalitzah the object of an analytical study.² He says, I believe, very correctly that the primary rite-object was the foot, from which the emphasis was later transferred to the shoe. Levy mentions that the shoes must be taken off in sacred places, on a fast-day, in mourning. The defendant appears before the judge, the excommunicated and the prisoner must go, barefooted. The shoe, more correctly, the foot, is the symbol of power. To put the foot on something means ownership. Every place on which the Ottoman Sultans stepped belonged hypothetically to them. In a marriage custom the groom steps on the foot of the bride to signify that she is his property. Levy also mentions an ancient Jewish traditional rule that a buyer makes a field his own by walking the length and breadth of it. According to a Talmudic passage, the taking off of the shoe and handing it to the seller means to give up possession of something. Levy came to the conclusion that the foot symbolizes the penis and the shoe the vagina. By this he contradicts himself, as at the outset he says that the foot is the essential thing, and it was only later that the

2. Die Schuhsymbolik im juedischen Ritus, in the "Monatsschrift fuer die Wissenschaft des Judentums," vol. 62.

shoe took its place. In Levy's interpretation of the chalitza-rite, the brother-in-law gives up his right to his sister-in-law, for which reason the latter pulls the shoe off the former's foot, that is, her vagina. As I see it, the taking off of the shoe is a castration-symbol. The sister-in-law symbolically castrates the brother of her deceased husband, with the assistance and consent of the community. In the story of the adventure of the Argonauts the one-sandalled Jason loses his one sandal while he transports Hera who is dressed as an old woman, over the river Enipeus. . . . Jason, the oracle says, will depose Pelias from his royal throne.³

A patient of mine, who suffered from a foot-and-shoe fetishism, had an urge that he anxiously hid from all, namely, to polish the shoes of his father whenever he could get hold of them. Analysis showed that it was the condensed expression of coitus with the vagina of the mother and, at the same time, the veneration of the penis of the father. Another patient, the one who, as I told already, was afraid that his shorts would slip, and therefore tied them fast to his body, suffered from streetphobia. Especially in wet weather and whenever his feet perspired, even slightly, his walk became faltering and if he forced it, he felt depressing anguish. In analysis it came out that the germ of his neurosis was an incident that he experienced once, or several times, when a child of three. He lay in bed between his parents. His mother noticed that he recoiled from her pubic hair, whereupon she teasingly drew his hand to her genital. The little boy feared that very much. Later, through his frequent walks with his mother, the infantile anguish was displaced to the shoe and foot, in fact, to the act of walking. As can be seen, the shoe symbolizes the vagina in relation to the foot, but in relation to the earth (mother) the shoe-foot symbolizes the penis. Robitsek equally recognized that the shoe may be a substitute both for the penis and for the vagina.⁴

The *Politika*, a daily paper in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, in its issue of July 29, 1928, contained an illustrated article of a rare wedding custom still practiced in the Serbian village of Lavcani.

3. O. Rank, *Beitraege zur Mythenforschung*, p. 399. Medea is a mother-symbol. The passage across the river expresses the coitus, respectively, incest. The loss of one sandal means castration. That Jason kills his father and cohabits with the mother, as told, stands in the middle of the story, but belongs to the end of it.

4. *Der Kotillon*. Intern. Psychoanalyt. Verlag.

After the wedding the bride and the mother-in-law go to a well where the former takes off one shoe and gives it to the latter. The old woman fills the shoe with water and hands it to the bride to drink. The village people interpret this really rare and strange custom to mean that the newest member of the family symbolically pledges obedience to her mother-in-law, and veritably humiliates herself before her.

All I said and quoted above confirms me in the opinion that the Kohenites take off their shoes before going to the platform to bestow their blessing on the worshippers, as a symbol of submission. This, in truth, means castration, the loss of the penis.

I quoted some of the precepts of the ablution of hands. The water must be poured on the hands by human act, either by the Kohen himself, or by a Levite, or by a firstborn, the "opener of the womb." By that the Kohenites manifest that they want to free themselves of and to keep from the primal sin, namely, the urge and wish to kill the father. Wine, as we know, is an old substitute for blood, for the blood of the father. It is for this reason that the priests must not partake of wine before the service.

But the killing of the father is not the only wish from which all must get away. They must equally guard themselves against incest. The injunction to take off the shoes demonstrates that they must submit to castration, in order that they become worthy to stand up before the ark that contains the scroll of the Law, a representative of Jahweh, whom the Kohenites are to impersonate, and with whom they identify themselves in the rite of the blessing.

Reik says that "a blessing means to utter words that will take effect in the future. . . . In the ancient world a blessing is not a pious wish, but an act to become potent in reality."⁵ In the Old Testament, blessings and curses occur very frequently. According to Reik, it is attested by the respective biblical texts that the essence of a blessing is a permit for the sex-act, naturally only with persons permitted; moreover, the promise of the fertility of the womb and the possession of the land, in short, fertility and the mother-soil. The primary aim of the priestly blessing is to secure the grace of God. And the biblical blessing-texts evince that God manifests his grace by granting fertility and soil. In the course of time the aim

5. Psychoanalytische Studien zur Bibelexegese. Jakobs Kampf. Imago, vol. v.

extended to include also other boons: the cure and prevention of sickness and the non-fulfillment of malignant dreams. In old Jewish belief one-sixtieth of the dreams are true. The priests are regarded as prophets. The power of prophecy consists of sixty parts. In the blessing the Kohen represents God, is identical with Him, and the people become one with the divinity through the blessing. Great and saintly Jews bless their children, and the people, before their death. Thus, they transmit their power to others. Extraordinary men, before their death, and but once only in life, can say words that are miracle working and bring blessing.⁶ When Esau was cheated of his birthright by Jacob, he exclaimed despairingly: "Hast thou but one blessing, O my father?" (Gen. xxvii. 38). Jacob doesn't bless Reuben, his eldest son, before his death, to punish him for cohabiting with Bilhah, his concubine. (Gen. xxxv. 22). He says to him: "Reuben, thou art my firstborn, my might, and the first-fruits of my strength; the excellency of dignity, and the excellency of power. Unstable as water, have not thou excellency; because thou wentest up to thy father's bed; then defiledst thou it — he went up to my couch" (Gen. lxix. 2-4).

The rite of the Kohenites, however, is not exhausted by its two component elements discussed above. The ritual code stipulates that the people must not look at the priests while the blessing is given, and even the priests themselves must not look at their hands while they are stretched out for the blessing. A passage in the Talmud has it that one shouldn't look at the rainbow, at rulers, and at the Kohenites (Chagiga 16a). All three are father, respectively, god-symbols. Behind the Kohenites is God; the Shechinah (divine glory) looks on the people, says the Midrash Rabbah. A commentator of the Shulchan Aruch says that outside Palestine it would be permitted to look at the Kohenites, but it is not advisable to do so, because one might think not of the prayer, but of something else.

To look at somebody else means to desire and overpower him. The look at God might arouse in one cravings for things that are due only to God. He might want to get the better of God and have Him in his power. We read in the scene at the thornbush: "And Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God"

6. Juedisches Lexikon, article "Jakobsegen"

(Ex. iii. 6). The people were warned not to get close to Sinai, when God descended to the top to reveal the ten commandments. As can be seen, the Bible affirms the primal fear of fiery looks and thundering voices that are mentioned by Hermann. In the Sinai scene God is afraid lest the people get near the mountain and attack Him (Ex. xix). To prevent this He overawes the people; there it is said: "And all the people perceived the thunderings, and the lightning, and the voice of the horn, and the mountain smoking; and when the people saw it, they trembled and stood afar off" (Ex. xx. 15). The prohibition of looking is connected with the primal scene. To this I can adduce an experience of my own. In my childhood I looked at the blessing priests, though I was warned not to do it, lest I become blind. The general belief is that by looking one's vision gets dimmed. A patient of mine in whose neurosis the watching of the primal scene played a great part, looked at the blessing though he knew that blindness might be punishment. He did it, which means that he protested against the prohibition of looking. In his "Totem and Taboo," Freud speaks of the fear of looking at the primeval father. In my opinion, the taboo of looking means that the son must not look when the father cohabits with the mother, lest he desire her and feel hatred for him. In this case the father will become angry and stare at him with his awesome eyes, and shout at him thunderingly. According to Reik, the sound of the shofar (ram's horn) is the last rattle of the murdered primeval father-totem animal that frightens the people, because it reminds them of the primal sin, the killing of the father, respectively, the urge to do so.

The peculiar division of the fingers at the blessing which is a striking and essential feature of the rite, attracted the attention of many a scholar, also of two analysts. Even the Kohenites themselves must not look at their own hands while they give the blessing. We shall try to prove that the meaning of this is that the hand is peculiarly God Himself. This explains why neither the people, nor the priests, who represent God, must not see God. In the view of Maimonides the looking disturbs devotion. Rabbi Joseph says that it dims the eyesight. But Rabbi Chagi says that he dared to look with no harm to him. In the Midrash Rabbah can be read that the looking weakens the eyes.

Through the lattice-like openings that the Kohenites form with their fingers, God looks at the people. The gaze of the eyes can be angry and frightening, but also loving, affectionate, and sensuous. Ferenczi points out the identity of the eye and the genital.⁷

Of the position of the hands we find contradictory opinions in Jewish tradition. The *Shulchan Aruch* makes it strictly obligatory, other authorities not. In view of the *Shiboleth Haleketh* the Kohenites tremble, for which reason they hold their hands stretched out. It is evident that to this commentator the position of the hands is not essential. Elia Gaon enjoins the stretching, but not the five spaces made with the fingers. Asherit is very particular about the spaces, as is the *Shulchan Aruch*. In the interpretation of the Midrash, God is behind the priests, through whose fingers He looks at the people. The latter wanted the blessing from God Himself, but He assured them that He stands behind the priests. It strikes one that those who stick to the five windows of the fingers motivate it by referring to "He peereth through the lattice" of Canticles, where in Hebrew there stands the letter "H," the numerical value of which is five. In the blessing, as we saw, God stands behind the priests. Who is he that peers through the lattice? Presumably again God. According to the *Juedisches Lexicon*, Canticles consists of monologues and dialogues of two lovers who are happy in their union and long for each other sorrowfully when separated. When the biblical canon was made up there was much objection to taking it into Scriptures, but Rabbi Akiba prevailed. He interpreted it allegorically to mean a covenant of love between God and Israel therefore it is the most holy. The Church takes it similarly as an allegory, but of Jesus and the Church, or of God and Mary. In Wetzstein's view, Canticles is a collection of wedding songs recited for seven days following the union. The text mentions King Solomon as the author, but this is wholly out of question. In the interpretation of modern scholars, it is

7. Ferenczi, *Zur Augensymbolik*, Intern. Zeitschrift, i. 1913, and Ibid. his "Reiben der Augen ein Onaniersatz," where he points to the identity of the eye and the genital. Reitler, *Zur Augensymbolik*, Ibid. See also Hollos, *Int. Zeitschr.* ix. The penetrating eye threatens with castration those who touch it. The loving eye protects from evil. It is evident that in the blessing the divine eyes are a penis-symbol. On the harmful effect of the eye much material is found in Seligmann's "Der Boese Blick."

a dialogue between the mother-goddess and her son-consort.⁸

It is certain that the worshippers imagine behind the five-windowed lattice, made up by the fingers of the priests, God whom they love dearly, and who, in turn, looks at His people with extreme affection. Freud says, in his "Group-Psychology and Ego-Analysis:" "We may, therefore, venture the hypothesis that love-relationships — expressed indifferently, ties of sentiment — make the essence also of the mass-soul." Here Freud, as Roheim remarks,⁹ describes the libidinous structure of the mass. In the same place Freud continues: "A primary mass is an aggregate of individuals who put one and the same object in place of their Ego-Ideal and thereby bring about in their ego an identification among themselves." This sensuous bond is essentially homosexual. But a mass establishes a libidinous bond not only among themselves, they do so also with the leader. We saw in the Kohenite blessing that the priests are identical with God and the congregation both with God and the priests. Ferenczi says¹⁰ that homosexuality is brought about, not only by a reaction to a very strong heterosexual urge, but also by way of regression, namely, by identification owing to object-love. A man gives up a woman as his outward object of love, and then sets her up in himself, puts her by identification in place of his ego-ideal. The man becomes feminine and wants a woman whereby he restores the heterosexual relationship. Roheim says¹¹ that "in many cases homosexuality develops when a man, instead of taking a mother-substitute for his love-object, identifies himself with her. On the other side, the consequence of this is the establishment of a paternal object relationship."

I proved that in the blessing of the Kohenites the congregation and the priests accept castration and give up their hostile attitude towards the father. This, as we see, has two consequences: on one side, identification with the father, the permission to become mature and a father, to possess the land and be fertile and to live a sexual life. On the other side, as it can be seen, the congregation thus establishes, in a homosexual form, the same relationship be-

8. Hide and seek is a much-liked play between mother and child. The five fingers of the hand are spread over the face in a way that allows the eyes to see. The players thus hide, yet see.

9. "Voelkerpsychologisches," that is also a review of Freud's Group-Psychology. *Intn. Zeitschr.* viii.

10. In a review of the same book and in the same issue.

11. *I. c.*

tween itself and God that, as it observes, feels, and knows, only exists between father and mother.

The worshippers don't look at the priests and God, as Moses didn't look at God on Sinai. God Himself, as we know, warned the people not to get close to the mountain on which He dwells, lest He destroy them. One who sees the rite, or experiences it, gets the impression that in it the scene of Sinai is repeated on a small scale. The worshippers engage themselves out of fear in fervent and devout prayers, they huddle together, cover their faces, don't dare to look up, they, as it were, prostrate themselves before Yahweh. In return, the divinity promises to defend them. As in the Canticles, God and Israel become each other's lovers. There flashes through this homosexual tie the original Oedipus-situation, the dangers of which the rite was to abolish. The people get the original and forbidden incestuous pleasure, though in a different form. My investigations prove Reik to be right¹² according to whom the Sinai scene, and the blessing of the Kohenites which I regard as a repetition of it, is in its essence the repression of the urge to hate the father and to kill him, and the victory of the love and recognition of God over the unconscious hatred and anger. Reik¹³ thinks that the masks of the savages serve magic purposes; they transform those who belong to the tribe into demonic creatures and totem-animals, they establish a primitive identification with the father. If I remember well, in another place Reik¹⁴ says, that the swaying of Jews at prayer, in certain times with phylacteries and prayer-shawl, corresponds to the dances of the savages which are the movements of the totem-animal with which the group and the individuals identify themselves.

Abraham made use of Reik's paper of the Shofar in his interpretation of the priestly blessing and the position of the hands in it.¹⁵ He was equally struck by the prescribed spaces with the fingers, the right meaning of which, he believed, was not found yet. "The fourth and fifth fingers must be separated from the three others and they must remain in that forced position during the whole ceremony. The great significance attributed to the posi-

12. Reik in "Das Ritual."

13. "Die Pubertätsriten der Wilden," in "Das Ritual."

14. Die Gebetmantel und Gebetriten der Juden. Cf. Langer, Die Juedischen Gebetriemen. Both in Imago, 1930.

15. Der Versöhnungstag. Imago, 1920.

tion of the fingers in both hands is evinced by the custom of having them engraved on the tombstone of a Kohenite as the emblem of priesthood. Taking into consideration the aversion of Judaism to pictorial representation,¹⁶ this exception must be meaningful." In the course of his investigations Abraham came to the conclusion that "in the priestly blessing the Kohenites (priests) imitate with the finger-spaces the cloven hoofs of the totem (ram). The prayer-shawl made of wool is a suitable substitute for the skin of the ram. The Kohenites, therefore, are in the blessing the totem, that is, like God." He says furthermore: "We have no other choice but to see in the priestly blessing . . . a totemistic rite." Frieda Fromm-Reichman, in a paper published thirteen years ago, accepts Abraham's conclusions.¹⁷ The priest's task is to mediate between God and the people. He is the totem-animal, he is identical with God. Eder similarly holds the same opinion.¹⁸

As can be seen, I arrived at the same conclusion, with the difference that I did not contemplate any connection between the finger-spaces and the cloven hoofs of the totem-animal. The Kohen when he stands on the platform wrapped in the prayer-shawl and his spaced hands stretched out for the blessing, is, indeed, an imitation of the totem-animal. It is true, the hoof of the totem-animal is cloven only into two parts, whereas the hand of the Kohen shows three parts in the blessing. As it is, Abraham arrived at the right conclusion, but in an erroneous way, at least, as far as the hands are concerned. I am afraid Abraham didn't know sufficiently the ancient sources relative to the priestly blessing. He should have delved into the meaning also of the "five windows."

The original biblical injunction that I quoted literally at the outset concludes with the words: "So shall they put My name upon the children of Israel, and I will bless them." Indeed, the essence of the blessing is that the Kohenites pronounce the proper name Yahweh in the blessing. The ineffable name was thus laid on the people who thereby became identical with God.

It is an everyday experience in the analysis of neuroses, that what is the most essential to the understanding of the sickness is forgotten and lost in the course of time. The task of the analysis

16. Judaism forbids only representations of human and animal figures, not of hands.

17. *Imago* i. 27.

18. *Imago*, 1933.

is to recover it and bring it to the surface, otherwise the solution of the problem cannot be a success scientifically and therapeutically. The same is true of the rite of the blessing.

For more than two thousand years the pronunciation of the name of YHVH has been omitted, but it has been done covertly, in a disguised form, in the blessing. I mean, the bearing of the hands. In the course of my investigations I found that most pious scholars, for obvious reasons, neglect this fact. The "Real-Encyklopedie," edited by Hamburger, mentions that in the time of the second temple the most essential feature of the blessing was the pronunciation of the four-lettered name of God, namely, YHVH. In the time of the rule of the Syrians, after the death of Simon, the high priest, it was decreed not to pronounce any longer the tetragrammaton in the blessing. They might have done so out of fear that the rite might be misunderstood. Perhaps it had some resemblance to a pagan Greek rite. Some priests pronounced it, but in a manner that it could not be discerned. They used a melody that enabled them to do so. This peculiar melody has been preserved to this day. The Kohenites still chant it when they utter the words of the blessing.¹⁹ Rabbi Tarphon said that he listened so carefully to the words as to be able to get the true name out of them, despite the melody. Later they forbade saying the name even with the melody, for it must not be pronounced in any way outside Palestine. Commentators of the Bible (Old Testament) say the pronunciation of the tetragrammaton as Jehovah originated with Luther and is totally false. No man knows how the name was pronounced. A great man and a miracle-doer is he who knows the mystery of the name of God (Bal Shem, The Master of the Name). In common talk, when not praying, the Jews are still very careful not to utter even those names of God that are permissible to pronounce. So, e. g., they don't say Elohim, but Elokim. They do so even in non-Hebrew languages. In Hungarian, they don't write "Isten" (God) but Ist'n. The third commandment forbids uttering of the divine name in vain. According to Jewish tradition, God had a name consisting of 42 or 72 letters.

A rabbinical opinion advises that at the blessing the fingers be so placed as to form the divine name Shady (SHDY). This

19. Following Reik, the tune in the blessing might be reminiscent of the last growling of the "Urvater."

word is seen on the visible part of the Mezuzah (amulet) placed on the door-post. I hold that the position of the hands was one of the most essential features of the rite. The Jewish theologians differ greatly in their prescriptions of the rite. But all agree that every word of the biblical blessing has significance. Some don't attribute any importance to the position of the fingers; others recommend that the fingers be held asunder; again others say that the right thing to do is to make five windows with them, etc. I cannot enter here into a minute discussion of these opinions. Rabbi Bachya, in his *Magen Abraham*, says what is most pertinent: "The priests must firmly keep their hands outstretched, and must symbolize with their fingers the name of YHVH." Rabbi Bachya, who was rabbi in Saragossa, Spain, and died in 1340, is the author of a mystic commentary to the Old Testament. In his book, *H'Emuno*, the manuscript of which is kept in Oxford, he deals with the various names of God. God (YHVH) has many additional names. As to the first name, Bachya does not tell how it could be symbolized with the fingers. But he says that those who know Hebrew will find it out by themselves. As to the name of Shaday, the method is known. In his *Magen Abraham* Bachya says that the priests when they lifted up their hands for the blessing, symbolized with their fingers the name of Yahweh. Others believe that this refers to the name Shaday. The thumb was the Daleth, the little finger denoted the Yod, and the three intermediate fingers the Shin.

We see, Jewish tradition has two precepts in the position of the hands at the priestly blessing. Firstly, the fingers must be so arranged that they form five windows through which God can look at the people. Secondly, the fingers must denote the name of God. The divine name expressed with the fingers shall be laid upon the people.

All signs would indicate that the greatest importance is the letter "Shin" which has three stalks. The prescribed position of the hand clearly shows this letter. The straps of the phylacteries, both of the hand and of the head must be so placed that they delineate the letter. Reik and Langer discuss this in their papers.²⁰ Langer draws our attention to the three stalks of the letter and to

20. Reik, *Gebetmantel und Gebetriemen der Juden*. Langer, *Die juedischen Gebetriemen*. Both in *Imago* xvi.

the genital meaning of the number three. Spiez does the same.²¹ Alexander and Graber equally point to the genital meaning of the number.²² The strap of the phylacteries must be wound three times round the middle finger and then three times round the hand. The middle finger is called *Ammah* in Hebrew, which also denotes the penis. While the winding is done the worshipper recites a betrothal-formula which is taken from Hosea ii. 21-22. It ends with: "And I will betroth thee unto me forever . . . and thou shalt know the Lord." In Hebrew "to know" also means to cohabit. Langer, leaning on S. Schueck's *Sidur Rasban*, says: "The going of the bride around the groom three times at the Jewish wedding directly corresponds to the threefold winding of the hand-phylactery." Langer quotes Bachofen, to the effect, that the finger is to signify the creative and nutritive energy: "Isis gives the Malcander-son the finger instead of the breast for food." In mythological thinking the finger means the penis. Hermann equally points to the erotogenic role of the finger. Langer does the same also in his "A Contribution to the Function of the Jewish Roll on the Door-post."²³

There is a connection also between the finger and the name. Langer, taking his support from Mahler, mentions that "Egyptian dignitaries carried the initials of the royal name of the Pharaoh — who was the incarnation of God — on the left arm, that is, on the same spot where the pious Jews place the box of the hand-phylacteries that contain passages of the holy Torah."

In our days all kind of fun is made with the finger, which expresses persons, or as a rule, sexual acts. A prophet of Israel promises divine favor: "If thou take away from the midst of thee . . . the putting forth of the finger, and speaking vanity" (Isa. lviii. 9). Hermann says that the fingers may mean the family.²⁴ The

21. *Zwei Kapitel ueber Kulturelle Entwicklung, Imago*, 1924.

22. *Imago* ix.

23. *Imago* xiv.

24. To the sphere of such notions belongs the so-called long nose, the making of a long nose by extending its size with the hand. The penis-meaning of the hand is obvious here. The meaning of the jeering is, according to Fenichel (*Die Lange Nase, Imago* 1, 1928), that though it be that long, yet, I am not afraid; or, more correctly, it is a representation by the opposite. At the same place Fenichel discusses the custom of ascertaining whether or not one told the truth by investigating whether the nose is soft or hard. This would lead to the problem of the oath. One had to prove with an oath. The original form of the oath was the laying of the hand on the penis. The two testicles are the two witnesses; hence, in Latin, the witness is called *testis*.

Well known is the custom of "giving one the fig." This is also a kind of jeering, and means the coitus itself, or only the vagina. This is the so-called *mano fica* that was widely used as an amulet. A goodly number of figures of it can be found in Seligmann's book, *Der Boese Blik*. He gives also the explanation. Fig in Greek is "ficon," in Italian, "fica." But *fica* means also *cunus*, the sex-organ of the woman. King Victor Emanuel made a *mano fica* at Solferino, that the battle turn in his favor. With the Romans and Greeks the middle finger was called "unchaste." They apologized if they happened to utter it in company. Homosexuality is indicated by tickling the palm of a fellow when shaking hands with him. Caligula, so Seligmann quotes, pointed with his middle finger to his palm towards Cassius Caerea, to jeer at his femininity. The Talmud, as Seligmann says, counsels against the evil eye by putting of the right thumb into the left hand, and vice versa.

I draw attention to the custom of the "beating down" by a third person on two hands, put into each other by wagerers. In my opinion, this means the contact of the three penes, the value of which is like a blood-covenant. It is like several boys who cross their urine in an arc.

Here I mention the Nazi, Fascist, Albanian and Communist salute, the Hungarian Holy Right Hand; furthermore, the hand in Daniel, that wrote on the wall the fatal words. Seligmann says and shows a figure, of a hand which hung over the entrance of homes in very many places in olden times. The fingerprint is nowadays used as the surest proof of identification. In Seligmann's book can be seen various hand amulets. One amulet shows the identity of the hand and the penis, another, a *mano fica*, is put into the middle of fertility (vagina), a third is a Roman legion-sign, another is a hand-sign with the shield of David on a Tunisian drum. Others are: a hand with the divine name Shaday, an oath-formula with three hands, a hand that unifies the hand and the eye, above between fingers a man and beneath on the palm is a mother with an infant.

To this I got the very interesting information from a patient of mine. In the centre of her neurosis was the compulsion-thought that her parents cohabit for the sole aim of begetting her. She imagined in her phantasy that she will write a diary in which her daughter will read that she is not the product only of a chance-coitus done for pleasure, but done with the intention of begetting her. She was jealous and envious of those encounters that her parents had before she was born. For many months, and in every hour of them, without exception, she carried out the following play: She pulled her handkerchief upwards between her first and second fingers and wound it once around the forefinger and twice around the middle finger, then she turned it back between the first and second fingers. The rest of it that was hanging down she forced down with her thumb. The other end of the handkerchief she wound through the back of the hand around the joint and held it fast. She unwound what she did and repeated it. This resembles strikingly the 169th figure in Seligmann's book. The thumb is the patient who stands apart and wants to separate the parents united in sexual embrace.

"The hand here is the lord of death." This we read in Hermann's paper *The Regression in Goethe's Drawing Expression* (Imago x). Mrs. Hermann equally points to the erotogenic significance of the hand (*The Foundation of Marie Bashkirtseff's Drawing Genius*. Imago x). Of the genital significance of the hand speak also Ferenczi and Rank (*Über Verschaemte Hande*. Intern. Zeitschr. ii). Also Daly proves on excellent clinical material the penis-meaning of the hand (*Hindu-Mythologie und Kastration-komplex*. Imago xiii). Very plastic is the figure of the goddess Kali-ma.

Hermann directed my attention to the Hungarian book of Maria Medvei (*Az Egyptomiak halottas tisztelete es halottas szobrocscakai. Ertekezések a kelet okori nepeinek tortenetebol*. Budapest, 1917). There I read the following interesting passage: "In the between-the-five-and-six-hour-room Osiris holds judgment, and there, together with the other gods who belong to his court, he judges the dead." The numeral "5" is striking.

Hebrew letter Shin that the Kohenites imitate at the blessing, signified teeth or the penis, according to Zoller, in the ancient Sinaitic script.²⁵ He shows that the shape of the same letter denoted the penis in the Egyptian hieroglyphs. The meaning of the finger as the penis is evinced also by the "Wolfsmann," whose fantasy speaks of a finger-wound. Freud shows that this means fear of castration.²⁶ Marie Bonaparte equally says that the finger may be equated with the penis. She sets forth in her paper that on amulets there is found the outstretched arm, as *mano cornuta*, when the little and the fore-fingers are turned upwards and the other downwards, and as *mano fica*, when the thumb is put between the second and third fingers. These three fingers signify protection from peril.²⁷

Name, hand, finger, and penis form a series. In common life the penis is often called by different names.

W. O. E. Osterley, in his paper, "The Cult of Sabazios,"²⁸ says that long before the appearance of Christianity the cult of the Greek Sabazios was wide-spread among the Jews. Sabazios was identified with Zeus, Mithra, and, especially, with Dionysos.²⁹ Sabazios was a god of agriculture, vegetation, and fertility. He had many symbols, among others, the mouse and the serpent. In his cult the serpent played a great part, which, in the interpretation of scholars, means coitus between god and the worshippers.³⁰ The worshipper is the woman. A prayer-overall of leather is used in the ritual. This is explained by analysts as to signify rebirth. The worshipper is the fetus, the leather the uterus. The Jews wanted to imitate the cult and were angrily scored for it by rabbis of the Talmud. The Sabazios-hand had a prominent role in the ritual. In the hand the thumb and the first two fingers next to it stand upright, the two others are bent downwards. The hand is always made of bronze. It is, as a rule, hollow and placed on a stand. The

25. Alphabetstudien. Imago 1931.

26. Zur Geschich einer infantilen Neurose.

27. Über die Symbolik der Kopftrophäen, Imago, 1924.

28. In "The Labyrinth," edited by S. H. Hooke, London, 1935. I got the material about the god from my brother, Dr. Arthur Feldmann, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.

29. He is equated by some scholars quoted in the Labyrinth, also with Yahweh Sabaoth (The Lord of Hosts) of the Old Testament.

30. In the prophetic books of the Old Testament the relationship between God and Israel in many passages is imagined as a marriage between Yahweh and Israel, Israel being the female partner. Hosea ii. 18; Isaiah xxiv. 13; lvii. 5. In Isaiah liv. 5 we read: "For thy maker is thy husband, Yahweh Sabaoth is his name."

Sabazios hand had a votive and protective significance. The three upright fingers probably mean a triad. Many such hands were found. On one the god is seen sitting between the thumb and the two other upright fingers, and underneath it a mother with her child is seen. Here we have the trinity: father, mother, and child. The Catholic church took over the Sabazios hand and made it a symbol of the trinity. In ancient Christianity the priest held his hand in such a way when he blessed the people at the end of the mass. This was the *Benedictio Latina*. The *Benedictio Graeca* was different. In it the middle finger was bent downwards and the thumb crossed over it, and the three others were turned upwards.

I find that in the blessing the emphasis was transferred from the spoken word, namely, the name of God, to the written word. Zoller, in his study mentioned above, quotes Berthelet: "To the written words is perhaps attributed a greater power than to the spoken one. The cultural progress, manifested by the invention of the script, filled the naive man of antiquity with uneasy fear. To him peculiar forces must have been hidden behind the letters."

The uttered and written name means the penis in the unconscious. To the former I can quote examples from analytical practice. As to the written name, I make mention of two patients of mine who guarded themselves against signing their name when they wrote to a woman to whom they were or wanted to be bound by a love-relationship. In both the reluctance came from castration-fear.

In the blessing (vid. supplement) the fingers of the two hands form the word Shaday. The thumb and the four fingers adjoining it make the three-stalked "Shin." The right thumb makes a stalk, the second and third fingers make another stalk, the fourth and fifth ones the third stalk, of the three-stalked Hebrew letter "Shin." On the left hand an inverse "Daleth" is made up, as in a rectangle, by the thumb and the two adjoining fingers, and the "Yod" by the last two fingers.

In the week-day morning prayer it is obligatory to the Jew to put on the phylacteries. With the strap a "Shin" is made on the left hand, to indicate the Shaday. The investigations of Abraham, Reik, and Langer, show that the worshippers, when wearing the phylacteries, identify themselves with the primeval totem-animal

father. I compute that with the strap they, as it were, write the name of God upon their hands.

The biblical passage enjoins that the name of the divinity be put on the people of Israel. We have no idea of how the name of God was pronounced in the temple of Jerusalem. We equally don't know anything of how the Kohenites manipulated their fingers at the blessing there. All we know of all these things dates from the time of the Diaspora when the original pronunciation of the name was forgotten and supplementary names were used. In time the taboo of pronouncing the divine name was extended also to the supplementary names, for which reason they signified it with the fingers in the ritual of the synagogue.

In the centre of the rite stood the pronunciation of the name. Only in it could the name be uttered and could the people hear it. The Kohenites were permitted to pronounce it, as they were consecrated for that purpose. Since in the Diaspora there is no recognized priesthood in the biblical sense, the consecration is done only on certain occasions and for temporary purposes, with the prohibition of wine, ablution of hands, and taking off of shoes. The meaning of these precepts we learned to understand.

The fact that the tetragrammaton could be pronounced only in certain circumstances and with certain ceremonies, shows clearly that the name could not be pronounced and heard otherwise. Why did God so zealously guard His name? In all probability, because the name is identical with God Himself to whom no mortal must get near. To utter a name means, as Reik proved in an excellent paper, to exercise power over its bearer. In the Bible it occurs several times that God, as a reward and for protection changes names. So, e. g., Jacob was named Israel, Sarah was made Saray, Abram was called Abraham. In the analytical literature the problem received already some attention, among others, by Abraham and Stekel. May I mention here an interesting Jewish custom that is still widely practiced among the pious. A critically sick child is given an additional name, to save him from death decreed for him. If he is called Shalom another name, let us say, Jacob, is added. Shalom was sentenced to die, not Shalom Jacob. By that God is given a loophole to exercise mercy He is asked for by special prayers.

In our analytical practice we can often hear from patients that when they are introduced and their name is mentioned, they

feel anxiety. An old patient of mine who consulted me, said that he stutters when he tells his name. An impotent patient of mine, now in analysis, gets frightened whenever he hears his name mentioned behind him. I explain this to be a castration-anxiety, that with his name, his genitals, his life, might be taken. I observed in two children that they say the name of the father with fear mixed with shyness. To pronounce a name means: to unite with its bearer, to overwhelm him, to attack him. The great significance of the name is evinced by the saying "nomen est omen;" by the experience that many hold it in high or in low estimation, or are ashamed of it; by the care with which it is chosen; by the wish to change it; by the belief that with it the ancestors are kept alive; by the custom to give the child an ancient name; to give a maiden a name by marrying her; by such sayings as: "he bears my name," "he brought shame on my name," "he besmirched my name," "I forbid that he bear my name," "don't take my name into your mouth," etc.

Conclusion

Summing up what I said so far, I see in the rite of the blessing of the Kohenites a Freudian phylogenetic pattern that symbolically reflects several stages in the sexual development of man and in the unfolding of the Super-Ego.

The father, with his fiery and fearful eyes, deters and overawes the youth about to turn against him. The aim of the youth is to make an end to the physical and sexual power of the father and to commit incest. For fear of punishment they must constrain themselves and rather acquire the love of the father. By means well known from obsessional neurosis, by not drinking wine and with the ablution of hands, they ward off the parricidal and cannibalistic urges; by the acceptance of castration, by taking off the shoes, they give up incest. By this they win the love of the father, even his amorous love, and between the two there is established a homosexual bond that unites them. The father's overaweing and threatening eyes, even his penis, are turned into loving eyes, into a loving penis, and through the lattice made with the fingers God looks affectionately at his people, Israel. He appoints his

priests, the Kohenites, who with the rite made themselves fit for the task, as His representatives to bless the people. The blessing is done in such a way that with the hand that symbolizes the paternal penis the Kohenites put upon the people the divine name that equally symbolizes the paternal penis. The god-father and the people with the penis thus joined together, as it were, establish a friendship, I may say, conclude a blood-covenant.

The blessing is given by the divine hand that, as a protecting and defending phallus, rises over the people. With the putting on of the hand-phallus, that is, the divine name, of god-father upon the people, the latter's penis becomes identical with that of the father. By the castration inflicted upon it the people didn't suffer any loss (only pain), it rather won by it. Like the paternal penis, also that of the people can now live its sexual life without any threats and danger; through the land given to its possession it gets back the lost mother, the castrated penis reaches the size of that of the father, and both the land and the people are blessed. Blessed, therefore, is he who renounces the repetition of the primal sin and incest. And cursed is he who sticks to them.

In the course of our investigations we familiarized ourselves with the Sabazios-hand. The aforementioned book by Seligman gives a fine illustration of it. Between the thumb and the adjoining two fingers held together sits the father, and in the palm, as in a cave, the mother with the infant.

We saw the connection of the oath with begetting, the position of the hand at the oath, with which a man proves that the child is his child. Finally, we got the impression that the three fingers are a trinity, that of the father-mother-child.

It is my opinion that the original and deep meaning of the blessing takes us to this trinity, on which the rest is only layers. Again we get an excellent example of the "series-formation" that was discovered by Freud, and that occurs often in mental life. With the finding of a drive to hold onto and to run away, Hermann took us a decisive step forward. He points out very emphatically that in it can be seen the great significance of the mother-child relation in life and neurosis of the adult. This circumstance plays an important part also in the blessing; it is complemented and made perfect by the addition of the father. Blessed is the condition

in which father, mother, and child remained together, were together, in perfect harmony.

The development of the libido disturbs this happiness. The described complications prove this sufficiently. The aim of the ritual is, to eliminate the complications that arise in the course of the sexual development and hinder the permanency of the happy trinity.

In the last analysis, the blessing wants to say: I, the father, who begot you, demand that you renounce your urge of parricide, your desire to cohabit with my wife, your mother, and that you assure me that I haven't to fear you, that you subject yourself to my authority. If you fulfill all these requirements you become worthy of my blessing, that is, to get back to the infantile situation in which we three, I, mother, and you, lived in an undisturbed union and happiness. As a token of this I put on your head three fingers of my hand, that is the symbol of the trinity.

I am aware of the incompleteness and deficiencies of my paper. But a more exhaustive discussion of the subject, its comparison with the puberty rites and other phenomena, transcends my ability and knowledge.

* * * *

I want to express my thanks to my brother-in-law, Dr. Hinko Urbach, the Chief Rabbi of Sarajevo, Jugoslavia, who called my attention to important material in the Hebrew literature. Furthermore, I am very much indebted to my brother, Rabbi Dr. Arthur A. Feldman, Hamilton, Canada, for calling my attention to the Sabazios-hand, and for translating this paper.

But as to the conclusions of my investigations I alone bear the responsibility.

MARCEL PROUST

By CAROLINE WIJSENBEEK (New York City)

In a cork-lined room with closed windows, away from sound and sight, wrapped up in flannels and taking the day for the night, Marcel Proust at the age of 35 begins to write the work which will make his name immortal. Only at rare intervals will he seek contact with the friends whose company once seemed indispensable to him and he now lives as much in self-imposed retreat from the world, as formerly the "grand monde" was the only surroundings where he seemed to feel at his ease.

We ask ourselves what was the past which changed the elegant, much sought-after frequenter of Paris "salons" into the invalid sequestered from human intercourse.

Marcel Proust was born in 1871 as the son of a Roman-Catholic physician and a Jewish mother. His father had a great reputation among his colleagues and did good work in the field of public health. His mother belonged to that numerically very small and very refined Jewish group, which in the time of Marcel's youth was fully assimilated to the cultural French milieu in which it lived.

From his early youth Marcel was a sickly child, given to fits of hay-fever and asthma, and hypersensitive in his nervous reactions.¹ His mother gave him all loving care to that excess which delicate children seem to claim and which in their later lives may become of such far-reaching influence. Marcel adored his sweet looking, tender mother with an adoration that wanted her all to himself. And in the self-confession he gave to the world in "*A la Recherche du Temps Perdu*" he speaks of the anxiety of sleepless nights when his mother's absence became unbearable, and of her night kiss which brought the peace that passes all understanding. His ambivalent attitude towards his father whose conscious good-will he appreciated at times, but whom he chiefly experienced as

1. One of the doctors in his work gives voice to Proust's appreciation of "nervous" people, "that magnificent and lamentable family which is the salt of the earth . . . we enjoy the fine music, the beautiful pictures, a thousand beauties, but we do not know what they cost those who invented them in sleeplessness, tears, spasmodic laughter, urticaria, asthma, epilepsy, and death-anxiety, worse than all these to suffer." Gu I. 270

a rival for his mother's love, impaired still further his harmonious development. The father's indulgence for the little boy's desire to keep his mother with him in the night, withholding the expected punishment for the gratification of his wish to do away with the father, may well have had its weighty consequences also.

Contrary to his father's wish he insisted on becoming an author; and he took further revenge upon him in the medical personages of his book who may excel in their profession, but show the one-sided practical intelligence that Marcel disdains above everything.

Already at school he showed an aptitude for writing and was one of a group of gifted boys who all later on contributed to the literature of their time. Bergson, whom he personally knew, had a decided influence upon him, although he never fully accepted his teaching. Perhaps he is most indebted to Ruskin in these early years; not only for his love for Gothic art, but also his aesthetic theories, show the latter's influence. Proust translated the "Bible of Amiens" and "Sesame and Lilies" into French and added copious notes in which he gave expression to his own views upon Art and Beauty and on the collaboration of religious thought and love of sensual beauty.²

The salons which he frequented gave him an opportunity of hearing good music in which he delighted, and of forming one of the staunchest friendships of his life, that with the composer Reynaldo Hahn. The circle of young aristocrats and the artists admitted to their exclusive milieu gave him an opportunity of satisfying his thirst for artistic enjoyment and for animated discussions on the subject.

As a young man Marcel Proust was cherished and admired in the highly cultured circles where he was a regular guest and where his eccentric attitude, his over-politeness, and hypersensitivity with regard to the slightest look or intonation, only seemed to enhance his popularity. He had many friends whom he sought to bind by charming kindness and generosity; but he lived in a con-

2. Far from having been an amateur or an aesthete, Ruskin was exactly the opposite, he was one of those men à la Carlyle, warned by their genius of the vanity of all pleasure and, at the same time of the presence in their company of a reality, internal and intuitively perceived by the inspiration (*Le Bible d'Amiens*, preface, p. 55) . . . his religious fervour, the token of his aesthetic sincerity, strengthened it and protected it from all elements alien to it. (*Ibid.* 59).

tinual fear of having hurt and thus running the risk of losing them. The vast correspondence of these years with its very characteristic alternating tones of pleasure and pain, shows that his own feelings also were exceedingly vulnerable and he seems at times to have lived in great tension and anxiety concerning these social relations. It is as if he knew himself, that he was not capable of giving or receiving love in the full sense of the word.

[The passivity of his attitude, the suffering meekness and humility alternating with sarcasms and pitiless remarks betray his underlying revolutionary feelings, his obstinacy in revolt, his hardness under an apparent willingness to efface himself before others. Deep down in his unconscious he wants to vindicate the right that is born in him against the tyranny of traditional morality. (cf. Reik: "Durch Leiden-Freuden," p. 162, 163) Characteristic also is the tendency of giving much too costly presents, of exorbitantly praising the work of his friends, even when he knows it to be much inferior to his own and of little real value.]

When he is 32 his father dies and three years later his mother. Then follows the seclusion from all earthly things, until the moment of his early death. Refusing to see his brother, the physician, who might have alleviated the terrible sufferings of his last days, having put himself on a diet of starvation, when he feels that the liberation through death is drawing near, he repeats the parting from the mother and the feelings of hatred to the father which were the dominant chord in the disturbed polyphony of his life.

Marcel Proust has never been able to overcome that period of his childhood in which he loved his mother to the exclusion of everybody else. The love for her persisted in its primitive phase when she provided the infant with everything he needed; that phase, in which the child feels himself and his mother as a perfect unity. This experience of love remains "Paradise Lost" throughout his life. He continues to maintain the infantile attitude in which nobody and nothing can exist outside himself and in which the outward world has no reality except in so far as it is the reflection of himself. "Man is that being who cannot get out of himself," he says, "who only knows others within himself and, when he says the contrary, lies . . . we are irremediably alone."

He was never able to attain fully that stage of development in which the libido reaches out for the object, and in his attempt in finding sexual relations of an object-character he never succeeded in getting beyond the homo-sexual stage.³

The absence of direct reality in his love relations is exemplified also in the increased "charm" of the beloved the moment when associations to works of art are suggested. When Swann in his married life has ceased to love the once so fervently desired Odette, but for the few occasions when she is able to arouse his jealousy and suspicion, she becomes dear to him when he sees in her a likeness to Botticelli's women portraits or when her hand suggests that of the Angel in the painter's *Magnificat*. And the memory of "La jeune Fille en Fleurs" against the background of the sea, the rocks and the sands as one of the little poetic group among whom his craving for love erred, enhances Albertine's personal attraction which in her captivity no longer exists for him.

Fixated in the primitive relation to his mother, all his later loves are repetitions of the only reality in love he ever knew. He will always have the tendency to keep the beloved all to himself, that he may be guarded against the anxiety of her absence, and on the other hand this absence with its uncertainty and painful tension will be a *conditio sine qua non* for the preservation of his love. He identifies alternately with the mother and the child; his infantile satisfactions are of an oral character or consist in gazing at the beloved object especially in her sleep when she has lost consciousness, is concentrated within her body and unable to escape him in thought or look. Proust recognizes this character of his love, when in the rightly famous pages on "Seeing Albertine sleep" he says, that "never he experienced anything similar since the distant nights of Combray, when 'his' mother bent over his bed and came to bring him peace in a kiss." He also knows that he speaks to his beloved one time as the child (he) had been in Combray speaking

3. . . . je savais quand j'étais avec ma grand'mère (in the book she is a mother imago) si grand chagrin qu'il y eut en moi, qu'il serait recu dans une pitié plus vaste encore, que tout ce qui était mien, mon soucis, mon vouloir, serait en ma grand'mère, etaye sur un desir de conservation, d'accroissement de ma propre vie autrement fort que celui, que j'avais de moi-meme, et mes pensees se prolongeaient en elle sans subir de deviation parce qu'elles passient de mon esprit dans le sien sans changer de milieu ou de personne. Quand j'avais ainsi ma bouche collée a ses joues, a son front, j'y pouvais quelque chose de si bien-faisant, de si nourrissant, que je gardais l'immobilite, le serieux, la tranquille avidite d'enfant qui tette." (Sod II, (1) 176).

to (his) mother, the next time as "his" grandmother spoke to (him). (Pr. I, 104-105) The only real communion, the only oneness with another life bestowed upon him, was that with his mother and instead of the development into higher, more diversified forms, there was, as he grew older, only the yearning for the return to the blessedness of his childhood.

As long as his mother lived he repeatedly tried to fulfil their common desire and become an author. He succeeded in finishing the two Ruskin translations and in writing a volume of short stories "*Les Plaisirs et les Jours*" which contains many of the themes of his later work and a promise that did not escape the best writers of his time. He was convinced that life had meant to bestow on him the vocation of expressing in terms of Art the message which would be the expression of his individuality, but insurmountable barriers seemed to make it impossible for him to live up to his vocation.

It was as if the mundane life he led with its many distractions and its filling of his days with charming nothingness prevented him from taking up serious work. The very fact, however, of his being dominated by what was alien to his brooding self-concentration and his thirst for an understanding of "true reality" is indicative of a flight from himself into that which is loud enough to drown the inner voice. But moreover, a vocation is of a holy character and he on whom it is bestowed, must be worthy to be its bearer. Was not there in him the unconscious murderous wish against his father; was not there the underlying tendency to inflict upon his mother the anxiety which all his childish illnesses caused her and the choice of this means of keeping her in bondage; was not there also that form of his sexual life with its uncertainty, its incompleteness and anxiety that never allowed him a moment of full satisfaction and was a source of continual worry and deception to his mother? One of the very characteristic utterances of his feeling of guilt is when he says, that sons are not always like their fathers . . . they achieve in their faces the profanation of their mothers. Also the scene between the composer Vinteuil's daughter and her girlfriend celebrating their homo-sexual relation with acts that profane the father, is an eloquent expression of his horror of himself. The redemption of the father through the birth of his glorious compositions is a clear exemplification of Proust's own attitude towards his work and when in his last volume he

tries to understand the profound connection between his own psychic experience and the work of Art that was its fruit, the thought of that same momentous night comes back to him when the "abdication" of his parents made his guilt-feeling find an expression in a decline of health and will and led to the daily postponements of the task he set himself. The removing of the repression on the day when the fulfilment of his vocation becomes possible "not only illuminates the blind gropings of (his) mind, but also the aim of (his) life and perhaps of Art." Words in which he shows the psychoanalytical understanding of the meaning and function of Art.

Consciously Proust may have wished to become an author all the time, consciously he may have tried to soothe himself by considering his good will and his hopeless attempts, unconsciously he knew that feelings of such suicidal guilt as he had, did not allow him the self-liberation, that writing would have been for him. Only if he could punish himself so hard that the ever present sense of guilt would be satisfied, he could allow himself to give shape to his unconscious life, to expiate his sin by committing it again in phantasies. Unconsciously knowing that there is no expiation for a criminal deed without its repetition in phantasy, he excluded the world and its pleasures — he excluded outward temptations and all the sensual beauty that had been so dear to him, and he retired into loneliness, into an ever increasing invalidism and lived under conditions that were the nearest approach to the time when in the literal sense of the word, he and his mother were still one. Then only he found within himself the liberty to follow his vocation.⁴

"A la Recherche du Temps Perdu" is the expression of the reality of Proust's world, a world that exists only within himself, and in which outward things may find their translation. For not only with respect to his sexual life, but also with regard to everything else outside himself, he is unable to come to a full

4. "Die Strafmassregeln bringen mit negativem Vorzeichen aber unbewusst doch positiv, die Befriedigung an der Tat, die Lust, die mit ihrer Ausführung verbunden war, wieder." (Th. Reik, op. cit. p. 376.) and "die Leidlust wird auf das Tun verschoben und das eigene Werk führt ein Leben, abgelöst von seinem Schoepfer. An Stelle des Geltendmachens des eigenen Willens tritt die sublimierte Form des eigenen Werkes, das sich durchsetzen wird als letztes masochistisches Ziel." With the "faculty of de-personalising his ego-interests" Proust suffering becomes fruitful (Ibid. p. 367).

object relation. "La realite n'existe pas pour nous, tant qu'elle n'a pas ete recreee par notre pensee. (Sod. I,177)

Objects to him only then have any meaning if he is able to reach a "true reality and diversity" behind their appearance. The outward world as it appears to us is the imperfect image which can be known through the senses and which the intelligence fixes through habit. "Only gross and erring perception places everything in the object, whilst everything is in the spirit." (T.R.II,72) It is interesting to notice in this connection the various aspects one person in the work offers to the different personages: Rachel, the actress whom St. Loup got to know in a "maison de passe" and who became a much appreciated actress is another woman in her lover's eyes than in those of Marcel; Albertine, a very insignificant, though vicious person to others, is the source of extreme suffering and much valuable thinking to Marcel.

The intellectual concept is that which can be communicated to others, as it is based on the dubious logic inherent in the intelligence and required in the communication of our thoughts. "True reality" has only an intra-psychic life and is that which the unconscious preserves in its hidden treasury. The routine of daily life prevents us from having access to this reservoir of the essential in our experience and it is only through a mechanism which Proust discovered for himself, that he was able to revive the Past within him. From his first attempts at expressing himself he vaguely knew that there are hoarded in the depth of the psyche experiences and sensuous impressions from the years of earliest childhood onward and that there is a possibility for him to have access to them. He feels that only thus he will understand the essence of things and never once he questions his gift of re-creating this inner reality in a form that will give pleasure of an aesthetic character. The doubts that besieged him in his early manhood were mainly connected with his search for subjects of such philosophical or intellectual importance and abstract truth that they are worthy of the Work of Art, never with the question of his ability to transpose the unconscious, once it had been able to reach consciousness, into its equivalent in artistic re-creation.⁵

5. "... qu'un bruit, qu'une odeur deja entendu et respiree jadis le soient a nouveau, a la fois dans le present et le passe, reels sans etre actuels, ideaux sans etre abstraits, aussitot l'essence permanente et habituellement cachee des choses se trouvent liberee et notre vraie moi, qui, parfois depuis longtemps, semblait mort, mais ne l'etait pas autrement, s'eveille, s'anime, en recevant la celeste nourriture qui lui est apportee.

The first experience in the years of his boyhood of the inexplicable feeling of well-being at the sight of the sun shining on a landscape awaked in him a sense of duty to see clearer into the exaltation that then could only find utterance in his flourishing, his umbrella, and repeatedly shouting "zut!". But every time afterwards when suddenly a roof, a reflexion of the sun on a tree, the fragrance of a country road made him stop "because they looked like hiding beyond what (he) saw something they invited (him) to take and which notwithstanding (his) efforts (he) did not succeed in discovering." (Sw. I, 256), he will accuse himself of mental laziness. At that time he is an adherent of the theory of participation and declares himself a believer in the Celtic mythical belief that he can liberate "his lost-ones" from their captivity within inferior creatures or inanimate things.

The first achievements in giving shape to the "reality" behind the appearance of things concerns his vision of the church-towers of Martinville during a carriage drive; their steeples, the movement of their lines and the shifting of the sunlight on their surface beckon him to something that these movements seem to contain. Then it is as if their solidity is torn, a thought rises within him that takes form and he has that feeling of exaltation. As he follows their appearances and disappearances, the variety of their shapes and illumination by the setting sun, he knows, that what is behind all this must be analogous to a beautiful sentence: he is able to write his first bit of artistic prose.⁶ (Sw. I, 258-262)

The artist can only communicate the truth, Proust knows from now on, when he expresses the connection between two different things "analogous in the world of Art to that of the law of causality in that of science" and thus extracting their essence, he will reunite the one to the other, liberating them from the contingencies of time in a metaphor and will link them together by that indescribable chain of an alliance of words. (T.R.II, 40)

In the interview which Proust gave to a critic after the publication of "Du Cote de chez Swann" ("Le Temps" 1913) he explains, that his psychology is not plane, but three-dimensional:

6. Ernst Robert Curtius who wrote a very suggestive book on Proust, although he fails to appreciate his psycho-analytical insight, contributed to the Swiss periodical "Wissen und Leben" (vol. XVIII, no. 28) an article on "Der Perspektivismus Marcel Proust's," where he draws the attention to the simultaneous perception of two movements in different dimensions of profundity, which provokes in the author increased physical excitement.

"I have tried to isolate this invisible substance which is Time and for this indeed the experiment must have duration." Novels of the Unconscious he calls his work, "not built on a memory feeding on the intelligence and the eyes, which gives of the past only faces without truth, but on "involuntary memory", when a scent, a savor recaptured under quite different circumstances, brings us back the past almost in spite of ourselves. Through the co-operation of the actual impression and the revived past the "extra-temporal" reality becomes conscious and it is this process which Proust tries to express in an intelligible form akin to a musical theme. The timeless inner reality is that which the individual may call his own and the shape his vision of it assumes, is the style of his artistic work.⁷

It is not in broad daylight, when the exigencies of daily life have their claim upon him, that the artist is able to resurrect his past experience; either a sensuous impression brings it back to the light or the state between sleeping and waiting and, in a peculiar form, the activity of dreaming.⁸

The reviving process which psychoanalysis applies on scientific grounds in its research and its therapeutic work is more or less conscious in the artist as one of the privileges that make him the exceptional human type he is, the other gift being that mysterious power of transposing his inner truth in terms of beauty. Proust himself gives an interesting explanation of the artistic potentialities of those contents of his psyche he is able to reach in obscurity and silence when he says that the truths one has attained in oneself float in an atmosphere of poetry, in the sweetness of a mystery which is nothing else than the token of the twilight which we have to pass, the exact indication of the depth of a work.

Proust was one of the few who not only had the consciousness of their own unconscious, but whose art is a glorification of this

7. Proust stresses his identification of "instinct" and "genius" in the artist: "he has but to read the book, dictated by reality, the only one of which the "impression" has been made in us by reality "self." The book with figured characters, not traced by ourselves is our only book. (T.R.II.26) "Only in my dreams, in sleeping, a landscape lay before me, made of pure matter," entirely different from the common thing one sees and touches. . . . I had too much experience with the impossibility of reaching in outward reality that which was only within myself." (ibid. 21|2)

8. Proust for all his intuitive understanding of psychic phenomena never reached that of the structure of dreams. He, however, shows an insight into their function. c. Sod. I. p. 183 and J. T. II. XX.

inner recreative process and of its hidden meaning. He knew of the inner freedom which the loosening of repression brings, he also knew of the expiation of unconscious guilt and its need of punishment through the confession of the innermost self and of the pleasure in pain gained by committing the mortal sin again in phantasy, not only for the artist, but also for his readers who, if he but adheres to his inner truth, will be the "readers of themselves". Much of what Freud built into a grandiose structure that would revolutionize human thinking in many fields, belongs to the elements of that dualistic world of fancy and thought which Proust created in the search for the "Temps Perdu."⁹

The most instructive example of his description of this mental mechanism is the rebirth of his youth in that charming provincial town of Combray.

The famous episode of the "Madeleine" soaked in tea describes how a sensuous impression may first awaken the conviction, that the unconscious can be revived and that it will yield the essential. This is how he describes the process: "then I feel flutter within myself something that displaces itself, that would rise, something that had been loosened from its anchor at a profound depth; I do not know what it is, but it mounts slowly, I experience a resistance and I hear the rumble of the distances gone through." While he concentrates himself on repeated endeavours to set free what seeks its liberation, there is a sudden opening up of the unconscious, a revival of his youth in Combray, as in the japanese shell which, when laid in water, opens and shows a whole town. (Sw. I, 70, foll.)

What is thus revived was a visual memory linked to a savour, preserved in the unconscious as a "photographic negative" and the "souvenir involontaire" gave it back a positive reality. In its concealment it was subtracted from the influence of Time in which it had been incorporated. It has now acquired an existence "en dehors du temps." In the last volume of his great work, where Proust analyses his psychological theories, he says how often in life objective reality disappointed him because one can only admire through the imagination and this means the exclusion of the actual

9. Cf. for Proust's "Discovery of the Oedipus Complex" the interesting article by Gregory Zilboorg in "The Psycho-analytic Quarterly," Vol. VIII, 1939.

object." But if a sensation — sound of a fork and of a hammer, even an inequality in the pavement — causes this sensation to mirror in the past which permitted my imagination to enjoy it, and in the present when the effective impetus to my senses by the sound, the contact had added to the dream of phantasy that in which these are ordinarily lacking: the idea of existence — and thanks to that subterfuge had permitted my being to obtain, isolate and immobilise for the duration of a flash of lightning what it can never apprehend: a fragment of time in essential purity." (T. R. II, 15).

There cannot exist any doubt concerning the resuscitation of the past, it is a revelation and yields a "fruitful and true pleasure." It is through involuntary memory that this inner psychic reality may be reached; if conscious thought is applied, it remains hidden in the "great, impenetrated and discouraging night of our soul which we thought of as void and nothing." (Sw. II, 190.) Words being the medium of conscious thoughts and the conventional symbols of human contact, they rather bar the way to what is the individual reality than that they would be a means of discovering it. "We feel in one world, we think, we name in another, we can between the two establish a concordance, but not fill the gap." (Gu. I, 45). Real communication between people is impossible and the most essential within us cannot be communicated without being levelled to the impersonal.

"That inexpressible something that differentiates qualitatively what everyone has felt" must be left "on the threshold of the sentences in which we can only communicate with others in restricting ourselves to exterior things common to everybody and without any interest." (Pr. II, 75)

There is only one way of giving voice to this inner reality: if words have to be the medium, we must string them together into a metaphor, thus lifting into the more fluent form of the comparison that which conventional speech can only impart in the form of rigid, conscious expression as a compromise of the different voices in the "polyphony of thinking" (Stekel). But better than in a metaphor, reality may be expressed without words when it takes shape in Art in a recreation of the incommunicable.¹⁰

10. On peut faire se succéder indéfiniment dans une description les objets qui figuraient dans le lieu décrit. La vérité ne commencera qu'au moment où

Thus "landscapes which would have remained as unknown as those there may be in the moon" may become transferable to others. The world is always recreated by the artist; it will last until the next geological catastrophe which an original new painter or a new author will bring about. For every great artist is the creator of a new world and if Science may have led to the conclusion that the individuality does not exist, works of Art testify to the contrary. We think in one world and we experience and feel in another, and if we are able to take away the names of things and invest them with the form which they have within ourselves, we have accomplished the only way in which Truth, our Truth, can be revealed to the world. Reading the "inner book" is already a creative act. His instinct enables the artist to read it; to his instinct he must always listen and have the moral courage to accept its dictates unreservedly, without the restrictive selection of conscious intelligence in its subordination to the purposes of practical life. He must give these findings shape in his art, thus making art into the most real, the most austere school of life, the "Last Judgment."¹¹

Proust is one of the very few who was able to raise this creative process into the conscious, and thus his work is not only the image of his inner self, it is also an exposition of the forces working in the composition of the work of art. But that in an inextricable way theory and poetic creation are bound up together so that the one can hardly exist without the other is one of the instances of duality in Proust's oeuvre.

The mechanism of the unconscious, the failure of the intelligence to preserve that which is of real value, but its indispensable cooperation when the involuntary memory claims shape — all that and many more theoretical reflections of other subjects: on repression, the strata of the human personality, on the meaning of the "psycho-pathology of every-day life" are formulated in such a way

l'écrivain prendra deux objets différents, posera leur rapport, analogue dans le monde de l'art, à celui qu'est le rapport unique de la loi causale dans le monde de la science et les enfermera dans les anneaux nécessaires d'un beau style, ou même, ainsi que la vie quand en rapprochant une qualité commune à deux sensations, il dégagera leur essence en les réunissant l'une et l'autre pour les soustraire au contingence du temps dans une métaphore et les enchaînera par le lien indescriptible d'une alliance de mots. (T.R. II, 39.)

11. Cf. the utterance on the "Last Judgment" to Freud's utterances on art as a conqueror of the feeling of guilt; also Hanns Sachs: "Gemeinsame Tagtraume."

that v
for in
of th
when
reality
ficialit
linked
coeur.
us is
us to
our s
to bel
in us
no us
repres
taneit
sensat
in the
patib
them.
havin
move
same

from
tion:
but t
teach
dislik
for t
whet
pages
proof
appli
impo

ego's
memo
the h
psych

that we feel what their discovery means to the artist in his quest for inner reality. Perhaps the most beautiful instance is the picture of the revival of Marcel's grandmother, a year after her death, when in a "*souvenir involontaire et complet*" he found again living reality. And only then he knew that she was dead. In the superficiality of his mundane life there has been no place for her because linked up with the troubles of memory are the "*intermittences du coeur*."¹² "Without doubt it is the existence of our body which to us is like a vase in which our spirituality is inclosed, that induces us to suppose that all our inner possessions, our past joys, and all our sorrows are perpetually our property. Perhaps it is as inexact to believe that they escape or come back. In any case if they remain in us it is most of the time in unknown regions, where they are of no use whatever to us, and where even the most usual feelings are repressed by memories of a different order, excluding all simultaneity with them in the conscious. But when the ambiance of sensations in which they are preserved, is recaptured, they have in their turn the same power to expulse everything that is incompatible with them, to establish in us only the ego that lived through them." (Sod. II (I, 177-178)) And so in his misery and illness, having experienced the same anxiety and having made the same movement which once brought his grandmother's loving care, the same minute is revived in which she bent over him.

There is, however, another duality in Proust's work which from an artistic standpoint must be looked upon as an imperfection: the best part of the work is the shaping of the unconscious, but there are long, dull, learned pages where Proust acts as the teacher and consequently as that type of man which he violently dislikes. It is as if this identification with his father is too strong for total exclusion from his work and we may ask ourselves whether the fact that he allowed those descriptive, intellectual pages to find their place in the whole, is not one of the strongest proofs of his extreme sincerity towards himself. If he would have applied the standard of his highest level, they ought to have been impossible. But he is so unrelenting in his demand of inner truth-

12. The "*intermittences du coeur*" is a concept that assumes successive ego's unacquainted with each other, but capable of contact through involuntary memory. If we try to understand in terms of psycho-analysis, these "*cessations of the heart*" they are the consequences of repression and occur under the same psychic conditions.

fulness that, even what he, in his very keen self-criticism rejects in himself and condemns as the extremely unartistic, follows the dictate of the instinct and must find its place.

The exclusion of conscious volition in the sensations vouch for the truth of the past they revive; evasion by purely intellectual work may have scientific, not artistic value. From these views it must follow that Proust has a very poor opinion of the literature that is satisfied with the description of things, where it is only the conscious attitude towards the present, that counts. Thus a cinematographic picture is made in which the writer's personality plays no part, whilst the artist can but write the book he does not invent, but which exists within himself, so that he must only translate it. "The duty and the task of an author are those of a translator." (T.R.II, 41)

Proust's lifelong fixation in the unsolved Oedipus Complex and the domination of his life by his yearning for the Paradise Lost of the relation to his mother make it clear, that the pleasure principle remains with him a factor of major importance. Always on the quest for pleasure he knows that if ever it is obtainable for him, he will have to pay a heavy price of sorrow. Pain is a necessary condition in everything which ultimately will bring him pleasure, in love and in art. Only then, when his phantasy is able to inflict sufficient pain, he is able to reap the reward, fully in his work, and only imperfectly in his love. The whole art of living, he says, is to make use of the persons who cause suffering to us as of "rungs of the ladder allowing us to reach the divine form and thus daily to people our lives with divinities. The perception of such truth makes me happy; and yet I seem to remember that more than one of them I have discovered in suffering, others in very mediocre pleasures." (T.R.II, 53)

Over and over again Proust insists on the element of pain as essential to the lover and the artist; and for the good it promises he is willing to accept it not only, but even to create it." . . . the cruel law of art is that people must die and that we ourselves die in undergoing all forms of suffering, that may grow the grass not of oblivion, but of eternal life, the thick grass of fruitful works"

(T.R.II,274) and "... whatever it would be that I should love it will always have its place at the end of a painful pursuit in the course of which I should first have to sacrifice my pleasure to the extreme good, instead of seeking for it there." (J.F.II,15)

The uncertainty, the misery and the occasionally hardly bearable tension of jealousy is essential to his loves, and it is enough for him to have, for a moment, the illusion of possession to kill his once fervent desire. In his work he takes upon himself the mental repetition of all the suffering he went through in phantasy and reality and he even adds all the misery he would have been capable of enduring, had fate been good enough to think him worth of it. In our short lives, he says, it is only while we suffer, that our thoughts, agitated as it were by perpetual and changing movements, cause to rise, as in a storm, to a level where we can see it, that whole immensity ruled by laws, which, posted before the wrong window, we have not seen. For the calm of happiness leaves this immensity unruffled and at too low a level; perhaps only for a few great geniuses that movement constantly exists without requiring the agitation of sorrow; besides it is not certain when we contemplate the ample and regular development of their joyful works, that we are not too easily led to believe from the joy of the work in that of the artist's life, which on the contrary was perhaps constantly a miserable one. (T.R.II,50-51)

The joy of giving birth to the work of art in which his unconscious looses its bonds and above all the price of immortality, of coming generations living in communion with him through his work, is the highest "crown of sorrow," from the prospect of being praised by coming generations "*erwächst eine Leidenschaft und ein Trost von solcher seelischer Macht, dass das eigene Leid wie eine Bestätigung, ein Omen für jene künftige Anerkennung der eigenen Leistung erscheint.*" (Reik,op.cit.317)

Happiness in Proust's opinion may be salutary to the body, it is pain that develops the forces of the spirit. It often reveals psychological laws, but always forces us to take things seriously, pulling out again and again the weeds of habit, scepticism, light-heartedness and indifference. It is indispensable to the artist, although it hastens his death and causes those awe-inspiring, ravaged faces to develop, the faces of the old Rembrandt, the old Beethoven, objects of derision to the world. But he willingly accepts

this dumb-heartache, because it can raise above itself the visible permanence of an image with every new sorrow; he can accept the physical pain it causes for the spiritual understanding it brings. He seems to see some strange, mystic transmutation of bodily decay into luminous spirituality and to seek suffering for its contribution to his artistic perfection. Happiness to him is "useful only in one sense, that of rendering suffering possible" . . . for if we had not been happy, be it only in anticipation, misery would lose its cruelty and consequently its fruit." (T.R.63-65). It is as if in ever renewed immolation of himself and others who are his creatures and his self-made instruments of torture, he conquers the omnipotence that makes him the God of his own world, in the work of art. On the level of the creative artist the child in him once again believes that pain brings his own reward, because unconscious anxiety requires conscious victory over retributive, avenging powers.

Proust's conception of the psychic meaning of the work of art is thus an approach in terms of emotional experience to the Freudian concept, as it is developed by his school, attributing to it the function of an expiation in phantasy re-enactment of the original sin in a form that affords aesthetic pleasure and in such disguise that others are able unconsciously to live through the same psychic process, thus affording them a temporary freedom from repression together with the satisfaction of their sense of beauty. Perhaps Proust's imperfection as an artist is due to the fact that not his entire work succeeded in presenting a sufficient disguise and perhaps also that is why he desires "when the work shall be finished (that he) mortally wounded, (shall) suffer for long hours, abandoned by everybody before dying," his work not having sufficed to make up for the "indifference with which he saw his grandmother agonize and suffer near him." (T.R.II,58)

But that he also knew of that function of the work of art which is going out into the world of men to win love for the lonely recluse who was its author, appears from the passage on the painter who "perhaps lived in loneliness, not from indifference, but from love of others and whose work perhaps was meant for others as a return to them, that people without seeing him might love and admire him, might speak about him; for a renouncement is not always total from the beginning, when we

decide about it with our old soul and before it has worked upon us by reaction, whether it is the renouncement of an invalid, of a monk, of an artist or a hero." (J.F.III,88-89) In Proust's own renouncement there is that of all these lonely-ones together.

And so the artist unites within himself the vulnerability of the child and the omnipotence of the god. When Proust speaks of the recreation of the world through every great artist he must have felt the revival of the infantile sense of omnipotence. Also the meaning he attaches to names, their suggestion and their power, his creations in words that rival with musical composition and painting in color, vouch for his unconscious belief in the omnipotence of thought. The name may become for him a real sexual fetiche (cf. the repetition of the name Gilberte, the juggling with that of Swann, etc. Also Dandieu, Marcel Proust: Sa revelation psychologique. Paris 1930. He treats names as children do. " p. 145). But it is to his gift of suffering and to that other as precious a gift, to be able to say what he suffers, that we owe Proust's work.

"Wer nie sein Brot mit Traenen ass
Wer nie die kummervollen Naechte
Auf seinem Bette weinend sass,
Der kennt euch nicht, ihr himmlischen Maechte."
(Goethe),

would have expressed Proust's deepest conviction also.

The ideal artist in Proust's work is the composer Vinteuil, the sufferer in silence. At the time when he writes his greatest work his name is hardly known and he lives away from the world in a little village. He is almost ashamed to show his work to the very few people he knows and who might have some understanding for it. He has got only one great love: his daughter and she betrays him and inflicts upon him her homo-sexual relations with a girl-friend. Never a word of complaint is heard from the artist who, when this "shame" becomes known to him retreats even more from human intercourse than before and yearns for death as his

only refuge. His sorrow, his hopes and his love find their sole utterance in musical creation of unsurpassed beauty. Proust does not go into a detailed analysis of Vinteuil's life, but in frequent references to the Beethoven of the last quartets we see that he understood the composer's profound suffering and his masochism as a powerful element in his artistic creation.

If Vinteuil is thus a personification of one of the most important aspects of Proust himself, the medium of his art is that language which Proust considers as the most perfect instrument of human expression. Music is the language that does not know of conventionalism and the fixity of the word; it is an eternal flowing and its moments of rest are ever varying expressions of tension, differing in intensity and possibility of duration. Music is the narcissistic language par excellence; ignoring the object as a medium for expression, it lives in the inner hearing only, and the beings it creates, the musical phrases, are "supernatural creatures" having independent existence. The composer brings them from the divine world to which he has access, to shine for some moments on our own.¹³

Who like Proust rejects outer reality must regard music as a means of communication for which unknown development would have been possible, if the language of words had not been a necessary consequence of the development of human culture. This thought points to his recognition of the infantile element in music and to his knowledge that critical consciousness is eliminated in this most direct form of unreservedly expressing emotions and sensations.

His favored way of picturing outward things and inward experience by metaphors reaches its most perfect development when the metaphor is of a musical character; a beautiful instance is that where he speaks of the charm of the hawthorns: "J'avais beau rester devant les aubepines, a respirer, a porter devant ma pensee qui ne savait ce qu'elle devait en faire, a perdre, a retrouver leur invisible et fixe odeur, a m'unir au rythme qui jetait leurs fleurs

13. S. Pfeifer: *Musikpsychologische Probleme* (Imago, Bd IX, 1923) "Die musikalischen Mittel, der Klangreiz, der Rhythmus und der dominierende Narzismus erzeugen eine psychische Regression auf die Arbeitsweise des Lustprinzips." In connection with Proust's "supernatural creatures" it is interesting to note that the author speaks of the feeling of animism aroused by the melody which makes the impression of a living being.

ici et la avec une allegresse juvenile et a des intervalles musicaux, elles m'offraient indefiniment le meme charme avec une profusion ineputable, mais sans me laisser approfondir d'avantage, comme ces melodies qu'on rejoue cent fois de suite pour descendre plus avant dans leurs secrets." (Sw.I,200)

Of great interest also is Proust's capacity of composing music in words; his wording of Vinteuil's sonata and septet, his description of Chopin's musical phrase are word-music of so suggestive a character that the musical-minded reader hears the composition within himself.¹⁴

Florence Hier in her book "La musique dans l'oeuvre de Marcel Proust" rightly remarks that the narrator's story in Proust's whole oeuvre is accompanied by music. It is that of the church bell in Combray, that of the sea in Balbec, that of the restaurant in Rivebelle; in Paris it is the songs, the street cries and the music of the "salons," it is the sound of the piano to which the hero sits down to play and to muse. And then there is always, deep down within his mind, a background of sonorous memories, songs, musical pieces heard in the past, which rise from the depth to translate in sound the color of his state of mind and body. There seems to be a close affinity between music and life as Proust conceives it.

When in his description of Vinteuil's septet Proust speaks of "the immaterial and dynamic combats" of a phrase that incarnates happiness, and another of a painful character in which the former remains triumphant "it is an ineffable joy that seems to come from

14. Le septuor qui avait recommence avançait vers sa fin a plusieurs reprises, telle ou telle phrase de la sonate revenait, mais chaque fois changee sur un rythme, un accompagnement different, la meme et pourtant autre, comme renaissent les choses de la vie et c'était une de ces phrases qui, sans qu'on puisse comprendre quelle affinite leur assigne comme demeure unique et necessaire le passe d'un certain musicien, ne se trouvent que dans son oeuvre, et apparaissent constamment dans celle-ci, dont elles sont les fees, les dryades, les divinites familiares." . . . many of these musical phrases known from other works, but in a new disguise, come back. "Puis elles s'eloignerent, sauf une que je vis repasser, jusqu'a cinq ou six fois sans que je puis apercevoir son visage, mais si interessante, si differente - comme sans doute la petite phrase de la sonate pour Swann - de ce qu'aucune femme m'avait jamais fait desirer, que cette phrase-la qui m'offrait d'une voix si douce un bonheur qu'il eut vraiment valu la peine d'obtenir, c'est peut-etre - cette creature invisible dont je ne connaissait pas le langage et que je comprenais si bien - la seule Inconnue qu'il m'ait ete jamais donnee de reconstruire." (Pr. II, 78).

paradise" and a call, superearthly and unforgettable and he asks whether this joy can find its realization for him.¹⁵

He sees music as the power that gives him access to the secret realities of life, the supreme guide to the understanding of things so precious that they are hidden to the ordinary mortal, and the means of expressing Truth in the purest form.

Besides the special quality of the language of music to which we referred before, we venture to think that it is this freedom of expression which music allows to the unconscious and its significance as an ever-flowing undercurrent in life, that makes Proust the potential composer he shows himself in his work.

In relation to Life and to Art there is one question especially that obsesses him: the question of Immortality, or as he expresses it, the question of the reality of the eternity of our thoughts. In the moments when he is in touch with the unconscious, when his being is free from the bonds of time and living in the "extra-temporal," his ever-present death anxiety leaves him. But there is such a yearning in him for certainty concerning eternal life, such an anxiety that it might perhaps not exist, that he comes to constructions so utterly unreasonable, that they can only be looked upon as rationalizations of his "triebhafter" wishes. When he suggests that the desire to act on the dictates of goodness, scruple, sacrifice can only be explained by our coming from a world entirely different from this one, he accepted a form of mysticism which in his later years at least, he had entirely dropped. It should be borne in mind that this paradise of all perfection is bound up in his unconscious with the pre-natal stage of unity with the mother. "The real paradises are those that one has lost." But throughout his life music for him is of a distinctly religious character and a link to eternity; he considers the joy it gives as "super-earthly, the boldest approximation to the beatitudes of the beyond." (Pr. II, 79)

At other times he doubts whether nothingness might be the truth and our dreams non-existent, but then he would have to

15. "Cette question me paraissait d'autant plus importante que cette phrase était ce qui aurait pu le mieux caractériser - comme tranchant avec tout le reste de ma vie, avec le monde visible - ces impressions qu'à des intervalles éloignés, je retrouvais dans ma vie comme des points de repère, des amorces pour la construction d'une vie véritable: l'impression éprouvée devant les clochers de Martinville, devant une rangée d'arbres près de Balbec." (Pr. II, 79)

accept that the musical phrases and the notions that exist in connection with them, would have to be void of meaning. This thought is intolerable to him and he turns to the consolation that, if in our death we can take "as hostages the divine captives of music, death with them would have something less bitter, less inglorious, and perhaps less probable." (Sw II,191)

And so the question arises whether in Art there is a deeper reality than in Life and whether the emotion music is able to give, does not correspond to a certain spiritual reality. Throughout his life he continues to hear in music an appeal; it says that something better and higher than all the treasures and even than that of love, is capable of finding its suitable expression. The vocation of the artist becomes a religious one, that of revealing to humanity Truth, inexpressible in words, and beyond the reach of the intelligence.

Of an artist whose work was so fundamentally honest, so unreservedly true to himself as is the case with that of Proust, it is only to be expected that the form is organically bound up with the contents. He clearly states in that last volume where he allows the reader full knowledge of all he knows himself of the genesis of his work, that "style for the author in the same way as for the painter, is a question, not of technique, but of vision. It is the revelation that would be impossible through direct and conscious means of the qualitative difference there is in the way in which the world appears to us; a difference which, if Art were not, would remain the eternal secret of each of us." (T.R.II,48)

If for Proust's style a designation were required, it would have to be called impressionistic. Whether it is in the exquisite representations of the beauties of nature, (the apple trees in Sod. I,211-212; the sea, *ibid.* 215-216; the hawthorns in Sw. I, 199-209), in the suggestive evocation of concrete objects (e. g. "un bol de porcelaine blanche, cremeuse et plisee, qui semblait du lait durci," (T.R.II,39) and "les heures silencieuses sonores, odorantes et limpides" (Sw.I,130)), in the word pictures of Vinteuil's music — which Proust composed himself — or in that of real composers (the sonata Sw.I,300-303, Sw.II,33-35,183-194; the septet Pr.II,63,75-80), or again in those devoted to Elstir's paint-

ing (J.F.III,98-104, his landscape painting *ibid.*187, the race course *ibid.*182,183) or Berma's acting (expecting to hear Berma pronounce the well-known words from Racine's *Phedre*, Proust says: "at last I shall see them bathe indeed in the atmosphere and the sunshine of the golden voice" J.F.I,20) - there is always an evocation, never a description. As all these experiences exist only within himself, they are never fixed in rigid outline, but always seem in ever shifting perspective of Time and Space, reflecting the psychic strata and the intra-psychic movements. His perception in musical matters is often visual, in painting it becomes musical and metaphors are the means by which his subjective world can be presented only. Speaking of the marines of his painter, Elstir, whose "probity makes him ignorant of everything before setting to work, because what one knows is not one's own" (J.F.III, 105) — he says that his metamorphoses of sky, sea and land into each other are "analogous to those which in poetry are called metaphors, and if God the Father had created things in naming them, it was in taking away their names or in giving them others, that Elstir re-created them. The names that designate things always respond to a concept of the intelligence, foreign to our real impressions, that forces us to eliminate from them everything, not related to that concept (J.F.III,89 . . . the rare moments when nature is seen as she is, poetically, it is of these that Elstir's oeuvre was made.") *ibid.* 99.

Everything of which we want to know and to express the inner reality is the total of many past impressions re-activated by the actual. Its image, whether it is expressed in the ever-moving medium of music or in the stability of the art of painting, always suggests the inner emotional movement and it is this fluidity that allows participation of others, who, through the artist's magic, live in the sublimation of their own unconscious world.

No wonder that Proust is a lover of that wonderful group of French 19th century painters, who are known as impressionists and of whom his own painter is the ideal synthesis. No wonder music is the highest human utterance for him and Chopin and Debussy speak in a language which he, as well as his reader, feel to be his own. No wonder also, that, when he rises to his greatest perfection, his phrase has the sound of music and at times, suggests color and perspective. For those who feel in impressionist art

a mor
disguis
tion o
uncons
logic a
degree
elemen
directe
reality
fairyla
of the
lilies o
or son
mauve
aux fl
que la
midi i
attenti
quelq
ant sa
teints
de plu
il sem
We a
the O
the su
for th
mood
solitu

old, a
opini
isolat
whit
tear
of ch
wher
color
ject c

a more direct utterance of the unconscious than in other more disguised forms of artistic expression, Proust brings the confirmation of their intuitive feeling. The "primal functioning" of the unconscious which does not know of the restrictive forces of logic and reason is reflected in a form of art that to a marked degree rejects these conscious factors, and in which the form-giving elements are more than elsewhere of an aesthetic character, i. e. directed to giving pleasure in freeing us from the bonds of outer reality and inner guilt feelings, so that impressionism creates a fairyland which we experience as a pleasurable reality. The picture of the little river and its waterflowers tells its own tale: the water-lilies on the lake, green from the shadow of over-hanging trees, or sometimes towards the evening of a light blue merging into mauve. A watery flower-bed and a heavenly one." *car il donnait aux fleurs un sol d'une couleur plus precieuse, plus emouvante, que la couleur des fleurs elles-memes, et, soit que pendant l'apres-midi il fit etinceler sous les nymphéas le kaleidoscope d'un bonheur attentif, silencieux et mobile, ou qu'il s'emplit vers le soir, comme quelque port lointain, du rose et de la reverie du couchant, changeant sans cesse pour rester toujours en accord, autour des corolles de teints plus fixes avec ce qu'il y a de plus profond, de plus fugitif, de plus mysterieux — avec ce qu'il y a d'infini, — dans l'heure, il semblait les avoir fait fleurir en plain ciel.*" (Sw.I, 244-245). We are reminded of Monet's wall paintings of the water lilies in the Orangerie of the Tuilleries and it is difficult to choose between the suggestive magic of the picture in colors and that in words. But for the one and for the other we know that "in vacant or in pensive mood — they flash upon the inward eye — which is the bliss of solitude." (Wordsworth)

Proust reproaches Elstir for liking one building because it is old, and disliking another because it is new; he considers such an opinion to be in contradiction to his impressionism, as it makes him isolate the object from the light in which it bathes. A little white suburban house, built for well-to-do middle-class people may tear the torrid air in mid-summer with as "acid a cry as the odor of cherries waiting till dinner is served in the darkened dining-room, where the glass prisms, on which the knives rest, project multi-colored fires as beautiful as the windows in Chartres." The subject of art is without importance, it is the riches of the unconscious

that count, for only they are able to invest the outer world with light and shadow, form and motion that belong to the artist's individual world. What we believe a thing with a definitive aspect is a hundred others just as well; each of these is relative to a perspective not less legitimate than that to other perspectives. "The universe is true for all and dissimilar to every-one" says Proust.

For the artistic achievement the only thing that counts is the indefatigable striving for perfection. The artist's conscience, the super-ego must in this "Last Judgment," show a severity appropriate to the requirements of creating a transfigured inner world. Only where there is that reaching out for perfection in the work of art the task will be done and the liberation in death becomes possible. When Bergotte the personification of the author in Proust's work, knows that death is near, he is irresistibly drawn to Vermeer's "View on Delft," where he wants to see "a little section of a yellow wall, so well-painted that it was, if one looked at that only, as a precious Chinese work of art, so beautiful, that it was sufficient unto itself"; he feels his vertigo increase but "attaches his eye, like a child, to the yellow butterfly, that he wants to capture, to the precious section of wall." That is how I ought to have written, he said. My last books are too dry, I should have put on several layers of color, rendered my phrase precious in itself, as that little section of little wall. His last vision is that of the heavenly balance, in the one scale his own life, in the other, the little section of wall. He felt that imprudently he had given the former for the latter." Having passed judgment on himself, he dies before the image of real achievement.

It is said that in his last conscious moments Proust changed in this passage what he only knew on the approach of death, and with it he expresses that the self-imposed duty of attaining perfection, which would have brought him his full redemption and the glorification of his mother through her son, had not been entirely completed.

ABOUT THE FASCINATING EFFECT OF THE NARCISSISTIC PERSONALITY

By CHRISTINE OLDEN (Los Angeles)

In public and social life as well as in our analytical work we meet frequently with the amazing fact that people are fascinated by a specific kind of personality and that they passionately, anxiously or stubbornly stick to this fascinating situation which obviously seems to provide them with no real satisfaction whatsoever.

There are, for example, physicians who are well known for their rude and inconsiderate manners. Most of their patients are greatly impressed by that very rudeness and — whether they are good doctors or not — their offices are crowded. Many girls of fourteen are crazy about the one or the other movie star in a similar one-sided manner.

Facing these facts we will try to understand the mental mechanisms of being fascinated on the one side and the working of the fascinating powers on the other.

These questions have been discussed repeatedly¹ but specific

1. Freud: On Narcissism. An Introduction. Coll. P. IV.
Freud: Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego.
Freud: The Economic Problem in Masochism. Coll. P. II.
Freud: The Problem of Anxiety.
Abraham: A Short Study of the Development of the Libido. In: Selected Papers.
Alice Balint: Liebe zur Mutter und Mutterliebe. Int. Ztschft. f. PsA. u. Imago XXIV. 1939.
Fenichel: Die Symbolische Gleichung Maedchen-Phallus. Int. Ztschft. f. PsA. XXII. 1936.
Fenichel: Fruehe Entwicklungsstufen des Ichs. Imago. XXIII. 1937.
Fenichel: Ueber Triumph und Trophaee. Int. Ztschft. f. PsA. u. Imago XXIV. 1939.
Ferenczi: Introjection and Transference. In: Contributions to Psychoanalysis.
Fromm: Autoritaet und Familie. Libraire Felix Alcan. Paris 1936.
Kohn: Lassalle — der Fuehrer. Int. PsA. Verlag Wien u. Leipzig 1926.
Rado: The Economic Principle in Psychoanalytic Technique. Int. Journal of PsA. VI. 1925.
Rado: The Psychic Effects of Intoxicants. Int. Journal of PsA. VII. 1926.
Rado: The Problem of Melancholia. Int. Journal of PsA. IX. 1928.
Reich: Der masochistische Charakter. Int. Ztschft. f. PsA. XVII. 1931.
A. Reich: A Contribution to the Psychoanalysis of Extreme Submissiveness in Women. PsA. Quarterly, IX. 1940.

problems still remained unsolved; a new discussion might seem desirable since the social problems connected with this subject have become so very acute in the time we live. We see on the one hand that individuals or masses are extremely submissive to a specific kind of narcissistic personality to whom they might be bound so firmly that for the sake of this problematic illusionary satisfaction they even refuse satisfaction offered by reality; the fascinating partner on the other hand sometimes gets narcissistic satisfaction from this relationship, but at other times he seems to have no satisfaction whatsoever; he may be absolutely uninterested in the relationship or not even aware of it.

A significant example is offered by certain religious sects. Once in Berlin a man, called Weissenberg, — the self-styled "Re-incarnation of Christ" and the "Maestro of the Cottage Cheese" — got very much attention. It was in a kind of huge stable where he and a woman assistant were preaching unbelievable trivialities in somewhat barking and shrieking voices. Every Sunday morning several hundred people, mostly elderly women, could be watched in ecstasy, sighing, screaming, yelling, in convulsions. Weissenberg was an old, fat, red-cheeked little man, with a thick white mustache, with quite a militaristic attitude. He had been a soldier in former years and had switched over to other jobs as well: host, coachman, etc. At the time, he called himself a "magnetist." When they screamed "those who follow Joseph Weissenberg will never be in need" or "any work will be sacred through the maestro," or when Weissenberg was barking something which was understandable since he had no teeth, — the audience indulged in convulsive motions. Then the maestro touched them without even looking at them, businesslike, as if he were handling a machine, and all of a sudden they became calm. Weissenberg's office, where he gave "individual treatments," was an extremely dirty place with a bad smell, overcrowded with cheap images of saints and of the maestro. I pretended to suffer from kidney disease: a young girl, not very attractive, made me sit down, knelt in front of me and began rubbing my legs mechanically while chatting with somebody else. Then I was told to go next door to Mr. Weissenberg who asked me grouchily what was wrong and stated that all physicians were criminals, that every night I was to apply some tea leaves and cottage cheese on my kidney, and that I had to

pray the Lord's prayer. Treatment plus tax: Mk.1.75. There were many court procedures against Weissenberg because cottage cheese did not do the job; people died and the relatives went to court. Weissenberg was sentenced to prison which only increased his success. A woman said: "My daughter was sick, all physicians failed, she was given up. The maestro just gave her a look and said: She will die. She died soon after. Since then I know that he is the real master." Weissenberg was given huge sums by hundreds of thousands of people. He built settlements of extremely ugly buildings and so-called churches for his faithful community. His emblem was the German oak.

The Weissenberg method differed in one way from most of the other innumerable suggestion treatments: Weissenberg and his assistants did not even pretend to be interested in their so-called patients or believers. It was the most sober, dreary, prosaic kind of procedure one can imagine.

The same problems played a main part in the analysis of a girl of twenty-four who needed treatment for her depressions. It was in Berlin in 1932, and I was especially interested in this case because it made me understand somewhat better the problem of leader and masses which was so significant at that time in Germany. The following remarks concern only one specific piece of this analysis, especially the transference situation. The patient was very pretty and an especially gifted student. Before starting analysis, she had built up in her mind a definite picture about the analytical treatment and the analyst who was to be a very superior, mighty personality. She first indulged in symbolism and interpretations, trying to be an especially good school-child. She was obviously disappointed by my refusal to give her the satisfaction she was longing for and instead of it confronting her with reality and analyzing only her attitude of the obedient child. Her relationship to me changed from submissiveness to indifference. In one of her analytical hours, while talking, I happened to bend forward in my chair, so that my voice came closer to her. She looked back, startled with an expression of great fear on her face. "You sounded so mighty and alarming," she said, and remained in great excitement for the rest of the hour. The next day she was still fearful, but at the same time relieved. It became clear that she wanted me to be the fulfillment of the phantasy image which she had of the

analyst: a superior judge, categorical, faultless, and almighty. Another patient with similar attitudes worded this feeling: "People I'm not scared of, I don't like."

Her relationships to her friends and her fiancé were quite peculiar. She knew most of them for a long time and at first she gave the impression of her social life being steady and settled. But investigating further we found out that she did not know whether she really liked them or not. She sometimes enjoyed their company, but most of the time she only felt socially obliged to them and they always were a burden to her. She was polite, considerate and helpful to them, but she never enjoyed what she was able to do for them, and she was not eager to meet new people.

She felt close to a person one day, maybe the next day this person was a stranger to her. And, most surprisingly, we discovered that the patient could not even remember how she had felt about the one or the other person, e.g., a fortnight ago. For instance, she dismissed her fiancé with whom she had thought she had been greatly in love, — but when he approached her again after a short while, she continued her relationship in the same way as before without recognizing that she had decided to break with him. When she felt need for support she approached him; when she felt more secure within herself or on better terms with the analyst, he did not exist anymore. Her relationships were not based on fundamental positive or negative feelings. Her feelings were quickly built up according to the situation and they lasted as long as the partner was present. She never carried on her relationships and she could not imagine what a reliable relationship might feel like.

But it seemed that there was one exception to the rule, that was the patient's relation to her mother. Although she had discovered in analysis that she had no tender feelings at all toward her mother, she maintained a regular contact with her. This mother was one of the typical dominating mothers, egotistical, lacking control, very excitable, being the boss also of her husband, who was a kind man, but weak and giving way easily. The mother was never really helpful to the patient. She used her daughter for exerting her power on her. And there was another member of the family, the mother's cousin. He was a man who was always right, knew everything better than anyone; he had studied agri-

culture, astronomy, psychology; he had been in the army and gave occultistic seances. He took interest in the patient when she was a child, demanding obedience, and as she grew older, he imposed his ideas on her. The patient said: "There was always a kind of excitement around him; I was in constant tension and fear with him." In analyzing the transference situation and the mother relationship it became clear that this patient could develop object relations only at the moment when she was in some way excited by fear. She established fear apparently deliberately, either by doing something forbidden, or in being masochistically attracted to dominating people or such people whom she made in her phantasy to be threatening and superior. But she developed the same kind of fear also of her own super-ego; she put demands on herself which she constantly was afraid of not being able to fulfill. And she tormented herself by constantly having guilt- and inferiority-feelings. In her childhood, under fear and excitement, she had developed into the obedient daughter her mother wanted her to be, — in later years sometimes trying to break the obedience by putting herself into dangerous situations with men. She did not enjoy her good looks, she refused to recognize her abilities, she felt indifferent toward appreciation and admiration and to the kindness people offered her. She changed her opinion or her feelings about people according to what she thought the superior person would expect her to feel: "I must be the way they want me to, or else they will not give me what I need." She wanted constantly to be directed very strictly by her analyst: "What you say, you should say violently." Thunderstorms and frightful sensations were what she expected. She wanted her love objects to be aggressive because her mother was a very excited and dramatic person, sadistically suppressing the daughter's own will. There was the somewhat mysterious personality of the mother's cousin who constantly teased the patient, forcing her "jokingly" into activities she was afraid of: jumping, horse-back-riding, or frightening her in the dark, etc., all things that would make the child giggle and cry at the same time. On the other hand the patient's father was preaching satisfaction in suffering, satisfaction in renunciation. The only one against whom the patient as a child dared to feel aggressive was her little brother. But he died as a small child and the patient was terrified by the idea that her bad wishes had killed him.

She became afraid of the great power of her own aggressivity and repressed her aggressions definitely; but she was greatly impressed by people who had the courage of expressing openly their aggressivity. She was very much afraid of violent people, but she benefited by participating in their aggressive power, and she was sexually stimulated by people who treated her in a sadistic way. "I want people to force me into a merry-go-round although I hate riding it. I put myself in the position so that people do such things with me." We observe the same mixture of sexualized stimulation and fear in every small child with whom the grown-ups make the so-called "jokes," for example, holding the children tightly and laughingly threatening them that "now they will cut their nose off," etc., imposing on the child with their physical superiority. The child is afraid, makes efforts to escape, excitedly giggling at the same time, and asking for the repetition of this stimulating play. The analysis brought up distinctly why due to circumstances in the patient's childhood her anxiety had to become sexualized.

This patient was not interested at all in becoming independent; her aim was to act and think the way in which she presumed that the mighty personality wanted her to. It was her aim to be the tool of this personality to a degree which gave a masochistic impression. The main aim of this relationship was to receive continuously from the powerful personality, to be taken care of and to be fed. These submissive people are especially unable to tolerate tensions, and, therefore, they are ready to react wrathfully to frustration. But at the same time they have to remain obedient or else they risk not being fed anymore. So they have to repress their aggressions. Their relationship is based on primitive needs, in the same way the infant senses his need for food when he is hungry. It is the so-called "narcissistic need" for affection and being taken care of which derives from hunger. Submissive people are fixated to a phase in which narcissistic and erotic needs were not yet differentiated, and this very fact seems to help us in understanding their attitude. In the fearful attitude of this patient toward the people, whom she imagined were so superior, could be observed the same emotional elements as in an excited infant. Her need for receiving was not differentiated from her erotic needs. The erotic tension in which she lived constantly was like a motor

which kept her going and which she did neither want nor dare to turn off. It is the same kind of infantile excitement which is characteristic for the excitation of the masses, who believe in the various Weissenbergs. Believing, instead of fully testing reality, is significant for the relationship of the submissive type.

In our patient one decisive fact was perfectly clear: Although she had given up the idea of her own omnipotence, she still had preserved the belief in omnipotence in general. She looked out for omnipotent people. She was not yet advanced enough in her development to renounce desiring magic forces of omnipotence and to build up a normal self-esteem. She needed the omnipotent person in order to participate in his power; she submitted herself to him so as to receive magic powers from him. That was the way to get along in life with such an intense feeling of chronic insufficiency.²

The patient renounced her independency and confidence in her own efficiency for the sake of being included within the atmosphere of an almighty personality. She felt: The person who is inconsiderate or uncontrolled, or who refuses giving and loving, must be sure to be independent of other people. He who does not need appreciation and encouragement from the outer world is secure within himself; he has magic powers, he is God himself. The patient's attitude is that of the small child who is aware of his smallness and weakness, who believes that his parents are almighty. To get a piece of the huge power of the adults, the child is ready to be good and obedient which readiness is used socially in various forms.³ The needed narcissistic supply is in fact psychologically what the milk is physiologically.

In hypnosis — but also in the behavior of our patient — we see that the "dependent" type not only is ready to renounce independency for the sake of the necessary "participation," but also parts of his most elementary ego-functions; he cedes to him the

2. The general significance of this mechanism of "striving for participation in omnipotence" has been discussed in the previous mentioned papers, especially by Fenichel in his paper on "Triumph und Trophäe."

3. The Leaders of various religions, the military chief, the napoleonic type, all the powerful fathers, promise paradise or freedom or victory in which, of course, they believe themselves; they promise fulfillment under the condition that the believers remain obedient. And their force of conviction increases the readiness of the submissive type to believe in paradise or freedom or victory, which is rooted in his longing for participation."

function of valuation or even of reality-testing (suggested hallucination).

In the normal development of the ego we can distinguish — roughly speaking — the following phases:

(1) A primary narcissism in which the subject has no objects and feels omnipotent.

(2) A phase in which this omnipotence is lost and the subject tries to regain participation in the projected omnipotence in the outer world; this psychic dependency is combined with real physical dependency; the self-esteem is strong when the subject feels himself loved, and weak when the affection is lost; the "narcissistic need" is not differentiated from the sexual one — there is no consideration of the welfare of the object.

(3) Real object-relationship develops; self-esteem becomes more dependent on the relation between ego and super-ego than on the behavior of the objects.

Now we can summarize: schematically the fascinating type corresponds to phase one, the fascinated type to phase two.

If the dependent type meets with the dominating type, they establish a complementary situation. The dominating type, being more or less narcissistic, either lives without object-relationships altogether, or uses the dependent's attitude as a confirmation of his omnipotence. The dependent type uses the omnipotent attitude of the dominating type for his needs for protection. Both types have no capacity of full object-relationships, either because of disturbance in their development or by regression. The dependent type, who represents a relatively higher phase of development, has no real object-relationship either. His relationship to people signifies only: They can provide me with security and protection, therefore, I must make myself dependent on them; consequently, I am in fear of them and have to repress my tendency to get my supplies by aggressive force. Several forms of masochism are determined by the mechanism described.

We see now that and how the patient developed instead of love relationships only relations of the type which by Freud has been characterized as "groups in two." Actually the mechanisms we described are identical with those effective in a person in hypnosis. The "almighty" figure represents power, security, protec-

tion. The same relations show up very clearly in the situation between the pious and his God or priest.

Our problem touches the structure of one type of authority in general which is a fundamental support of our society. Social and family life, religion, education, politics including business, etc., — all these institutions are based on the idea of authority which asks for obedience and promises protection in return.

Concluding, I refer to a characteristic picture of the relation situation between the fascinating and the fascinated type in love-life, given by Goethe in a beautiful poem. This is how he describes this situation in love-life:

Show to women gentle care
It's the way their hearts to master.
And who has the pluck to dare
May get on a good deal faster.
But who does not seem concerned,
Stays remote and quite unbending,
He seduces by offending.⁴

4. Geh' den Weibern zart entgegen,
Du gewinnst sie auf mein Wort.
Und wer rasch ist und verwegen,
Kommt vielleicht noch besser fort.
Doch, wem wenig dran gelegen
Scheinet, ob er reizt und ruehrt,
Der beleidigt, der verfuehrt.

PSYCHOTHERAPY AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS

By HANNES SACHS (Boston)

For a long time the only weapon that man knew and used in his fight against disease, pain and death was psychotherapy in primitive form. The powers against which its help was invoked and the methods to make its force serviceable were different from ours; it was the time of the great ancestors of our present psychotherapy. Today, even with its enfeebled claims and its narrowing scope, it still is indebted to this inheritance from the past.

By the old concept all the sufferings to which mankind is heir, were attributed to one and the same, decidedly non-materialistic causation. It was called evil spirits, demons, magic, witchcraft, sorcery and the like, but all these names and many others meant the identical thing — to be pursued or possessed by supernatural enemies. The attacker might be a devil or an offended deity or a mere mortal who somehow had succeeded in acquiring super-human powers. It did not make much difference if the ill will had been provoked by bad intention or incurred unwittingly, nor if it was a case of just retribution or sheer malevolence. The constant factor in this variety was the unshakable conviction that only a wishing power of a high order — a psychic agent — could produce these fatal results. This dangerous psychic force was not obliged to descend from its spiritual level and to use the ordinary forms of physical aggression. It worked throughout spiritually, as an invisible and uncontrollable emanation, unrestricted by the limitations of space, like "the stuff dreams are made of" — which, in fact, it was.

In order to be effective against these hostile powers, prevention or cure was bound to meet them on their own ground, as one spiritual, psychic force opposed to the other. The beginning of therapy was psychotherapy.

This is not the place to attempt a description by what means the recognition of natural causes and their effects invaded the sacred realms of therapy. It was done very slowly and hesitatingly, with many backslidings and under stubborn protest:

it could not possibly be done otherwise, since it came as a shock, shattering some of the illusions dearest to the race of man, and therefore had to be repeated again and again till it became endurable. The idea that human wisdom is helpless in face of pain and disease, that factual means and reasonable thinking are of no use holds, in spite of its practical drawbacks, some strong allurements for the human mind. As long as it is not tarnished by knowledge and harsh experience the universal hope that anything, everything may happen any moment "as by magic" remains unimpaired. Besides, it is more gratifying to be the victim of the supernatural aggressor than of invisible bugs. A man laid up with a high temperature would naturally prefer to think of himself as the target of the arrows sent by Appollo "walking like the night" and to expect that he could be cured without delay if only a certain king could be prevailed upon to send a certain maid back to her father. It is much harder to admit that he had typhoid fever, because like a damned fool he had been drinking contaminated water, and to hope that he might eventually if he behaved himself, in the course of a long and tedious illness and convalescence get cured.

Compromises of every sort have been tried to bring about a reconciliation of these two antagonists, magic and science, — in order to satisfy the wishes of the great multitude who wanted to retain the belief in magic and yet to profit by the benefits of science. All these attempts have ended in failure. Wishful thinking, hope and vanity had to give way to the development of science in many fields of therapy and hygiene. The unaided strength of reason and truth would hardly have sufficed for the achievement of such triumphs, had they not been helped by the urge for self-preservation and by the fear of pain. Under these banners medical science was able to march on from one hard-won victory to the next.

These compromises have been — and still are — attempted with the strongest persistence and fiercest determination when psychical problems were concerned, that is in the field of psychotherapy. It seems that the subject about which the human mind is most sensitive and which it wants least to expose to the merciless probing of scientific investigation, is the human mind.

The motive behind this attitude is simple: In the stage

when wish-created phantasy has its full sway, the belief in the continuation of personal existence after death, can, in one way or another, easily be maintained; when the mystery of the soul becomes subjected to scientific thought, it becomes increasingly dubious and either vanishes into thin air altogether, or, as a last refuge, dissolves itself into vague forms which do not give much emotional satisfaction. The price for a longer span of life and less physical pain has to be paid in immortality.

This has always proved to be a powerful factor in keeping psychotherapy nearer to the origin from which the rest of the medical science had been set free. One half of the promises of medicine did not apply anyway to psychotherapy. It was never able to hold out a promise of any substantial addition to the allotted span of life, a thing which organic medicine can do truthfully and successfully. Was it then worth while to enter into doubts and worries, to accept, however halfheartedly, the non-existence of an immortal soul and the final extinction of individual life by death? The only reward that could be expected in return for so much courage and self-denial was to be spared certain forms of misery and distress. In this promise at least — if a promise it was — psychotherapy could rank as an equal with all other branches of medicine since psychic anguish is as much of a fiend and torturer as physical pain.

Psychotherapy has therefore a standing different from that of all other therapies in regard to these three points: it is more closely bound to the common origin of all therapy — to magic; its scientific foundation demands a far greater amount of moral fortitude from its devotees. Lastly, its only aim is the fight against pain and suffering — the pursuit of happiness.

II.

The ending of the foregoing paragraph looks like an attempt to smuggle in the "Pursuit of Happiness," which had been heralded by the title, at the back door and under cover of a sonorous phrase. No such juggling is intended. The fact that psychotherapy, unable to fight death, had to focus all its real or pretended strength on the alleviation of pain, shall not, by

a slight of hand, get changed into the Pursuit of Happiness. We have to find out how this positive aim stems from the purely negative one and supersedes it.

A man who has broken his leg and recovered its use after some rather painful treatment, feels perfectly satisfied. He will not expect that the cure should compensate his pains and troubles by making him a ballet-dancer, he does not even hope that his style and steps should become superior to what they had been before his accident. But this is just the sort of thing which the average patient will expect and even insist on as the result of a psychotherapeutic cure. He will be bitterly disappointed if it will leave him exactly on the same spot where he was before he called in the doctor. This curious, but general attitude has several good reasons. One of them we have met before. Psychotherapy stays near to the magical origin of medicine and farther off from the reality principle; even when those who have made it their sphere of activity strive to put it on a strictly scientific basis — as some do and many think they do — even then the primitive attitude prevails with the passive partner — the patient. He feels although he may neither think nor say so, that this therapy by words has either unlimited power or none at all. If the first is the case, why be satisfied with the mere alleviation of pain? If Aladdin's lamp is thrust into your hands you can surely put it to a better use than that! On the other hand, when the belief in this omnipotence has waned, there is no room left for restricted hopes and modest expectations; faith and hope disappear altogether without leaving a trace behind them.

Every neurotic is convinced (and he has his reasons) that life has treated him unjustly, withholding from him the share of happiness which it accords to others. He resents unfairness bitterly, especially when it has been committed against himself. This is nothing peculiar, but general human fashion. He is peculiar only in so far that he is not willing to forget his grudge and forgive his wrongs. He will rather reject the gifts that life offers than accept them without the back payment of the old debt due to him. He has his extra bill permanently ready for presentation. But "life" being anonymous he has no other way to send in his claim than c/o a person who is supposed to know the right address. This is, of course, his psychotherapist. If the

payment of the arrears does fail to turn up he concludes that it was the wrong address and reacts accordingly. No happiness — no therapy.

The selfsame people who will accept happiness only on their own terms, are even more desirous for it than the general run of humanity. Maybe they started life with a higher capacity for it or with an experience of more intense enjoyment; in any case they go on hankering after their lost paradise and yet are afraid of every attempt to reenter it.

Setting aside these peculiarities of the "neurotic temperament" — is it possible to touch the mind at any point, to handle any one of its problems without stirring its ever ready desire for happiness? Men have found happiness in sorrow, happiness in deprivation, happiness even in physical pain. But health, psychic equilibrium, protection from intrapsychic danger sound like empty words without happiness; they would be mere abstractions without real content.

The religious belief which so many widely divergent creeds have in common, that the soul is given to man as a means to lead him to happiness — if not here, then hereafter — is a proof of the deeply ingrained universal conviction that happiness is the ultimate, if not the exclusive purpose of the psyche. Schiller's words express it together with Beethoven's music: "Every being drinks happiness from nature's breast. Everyone, good or bad, follows its rosy lead."¹ Thus the contrast that we have stated between the man who broke his leg and the man who became neurotic vanishes, or rather, we find that it existed only in appearance. As a matter of fact the neurotic demands the same as any other patient, namely that the organ which has been disordered by illness or injury should be restored to its normal functions. The normal function of the mind is the pursuit of happiness.

A slight suspicion of a difference between these two illustrative cases remains lurking in the darkness to which unwelcome questions are consigned. No doubt exists that the leg

1. Schiller, *An die Freude*:

"Freude trinken alle Wesen
An den Brüsten der Natur:
Alle Guten, alle Bösen
Folgen ihrer Rosenspur."

could actually be used for walking, jumping or dancing till it was broken or that the stomach has digested the food all right till its functions were upset by an ulcer; but has the quest for happiness ever been truly successful before things began to happen? This is by no means a foregone conclusion although the patient may not feel in the mood to have it openly and squarely put before him. He demands a restitution — what the Roman law calls "*restitutio in integrum*" — but in fact it is not a restitution of what he actually was possessed of, but the restitution of something which he, like everybody else considered as his just and natural claim from the day of his birth. If it has been denied to him it was by the caprice of an unfriendly fate: That is his logic and ours too - as far as we are not psychotherapists.

III.

We have seen the situation in which the psychotherapist finds himself. Which ways to deal with it are open to him?

Some of them are dangerously near to quackery or lead directly towards it. There is first the pseudo-scientific method. The therapist tries to find shelter behind the use of all sorts of new devices, gadgets, charts, statistics and what not. They give to the proceeding the disguise of an extremely up-to-date, highly scientific method. The personality of the therapist stays outside, his attitude is that of serene, unruffled objectivity. In acting or rather not acting in this way he neglects his first and foremost duty, to receive as much as possible of the patient's self-revelation, to understand his state of mind as thoroughly as human nature can be understood, to keep in touch with his wishes and hopes, his sorrows and anxieties. This can be done only when he tries to reconstruct within himself another person's psychic life and disdains to withdraw into the rigid shell of mechanization and artificiality. No other receiving apparatus or detector exists for the secrets of the human mind.

Indeed, even in the therapy of diseases of the body the exaggerated use of these devices which are the pride and glory of modern science may become detrimental when they are used as a screen that hides the patient from the doctor, the doctor from the

patient. No fully effective physical therapy is possible without some participation — often quite unintentional and ignored by both parties — of psychotherapy.

The psychotherapist or psychiatrist makes himself ridiculous if he tries to place himself side by side with the heart- and stomach-, nose- and throat-doctor by pretending that his work is as well safeguarded as theirs which can be controlled by the microscope, X-rays, blood counts, serum reactions and many similar accurately measurable tests. The fact cannot be denied that he operates on a different, more precarious level; he cannot shake a thermometer in the face of the doubts and dangers that beset him. He ought not to try to obscure his situation, but face — not without pride — the fact that he is a pioneer who has to blaze new trails through unexplored regions, just as the great pathfinders of internal medicine did nearly a hundred years ago.

Another way which lies open invitingly to the psychotherapist is to choose one of the many pseudo-magical methods. But here the "pseudo" has to be taken with several grains of salt. Most of them are nothing else but downright continuation of the old, primitive magic with a slight cloak of verbiage thrown around it. Yogi, Christian Science, Faithhealing, are all working along these lines, hence their immense popularity and their unreliable, but undeniable results. They promise not only cure but happiness in their straightforward, undoubting manner — if not to be had on this side of the grave, then sure to come after arriving beyond it. This easy shifting from one side to the other is a great help when the expectations of happiness in this life become dimmer. A rubber check is as good as a valid one when you don't present it in order to pay your rent or buy your victuals.

It is an open question how strong the belief of a healer of this order in his own doctrines and their promises must be in order to become sufficiently impressive and efficacious for his patients. It seems that his belief in himself is far more important. Theories and scientific ornamentations are but the vehicle to put his narcissistic self-assurance across. He is at his best if he can keep these flexible and unhampered by the rigidity of a system or of logical thinking. But even when he is at his best, he cannot work out the successful results of his therapy according to plan and intention. All this belongs to an invisible power which he

uses as well as he can without controlling it. He is like the giant in Goethe's "Maerchen": (*Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten*) who cannot do anything with his body, but his shadow is very powerful."

Another way for the psychotherapist — but this is a hard and stony one; instead of promising happiness to give as much of it as it is in his power to bestow. He cannot give riches nor beauty, strength, health nor youth, but he may be willing to part with great stores of what his patients prize higher than all other gifts — love. Love means the best part of happiness for his patients although this love may be curiously deflected, disguised, twisted around, disfigured or even decomposed. It is the love bestowed by any acceptable substitute for their earlier love object — including the love obtained from their own super-ego — which they ardently and persistently desire. Universal experience shows that it is comparatively easy for the therapist to gain entrance into this enchanted garden, but once in it he finds himself caught in a maze. He has then the choice between running in circles indefinitely or breaking out by dint of brute force or base wiles and thus risks doing more damage in the end than good at the beginning. No details about the insatiable thirst for love of the neurotic — identical with his unending pursuit of happiness — need be given here. But looking at the problem from the side of the psychotherapist, we find that his store of love is in fact — except with some very rare and unusual personalities — by no means inexhaustible. It shrinks in the face of disappointment, stubbornness, hostility, aggression, the wish to establish an exclusive monopoly or the tendency to devour him entirely from top to toe. It is a sad situation when he has to admit to himself that the demand exceeds the supply and that he is not able to repeat the miracle of the two loaves and three fishes. He feels like an impostor and either is found henceforward to act as such or slink away with bowed head.

To mention one more of the ways open to psychotherapeutic technique: The therapist sets himself and all his surroundings up to stand before the admiring eyes of his patients as a standard pattern. It means that he demonstrates the ideal way of living in his own person; nothing more is necessary for them than to imitate this ideal as closely as possible and all their problems will

be solved, one after another. The identification with a self-elected impersonation of the ideal can work wonders. This is proved by the phenomena of mass psychology which occur every day before our eyes. But in the single case this desire to become another person than one really is, ends by wrenching and disjoining the natural reactions and emotions and this may one day lead up to the danger point of a breakdown. These people walk on the air instead of on the hard and dusty earth, but they walk with crippled feet. Nobody, of course, can produce these effects who does not possess his own, never wavering self-approbation. To act the part of the ideal he must be sure that he deserves happiness — that's easy; but also that he has got what he deserved, and that's not quite so easy.

IV.

Our conclusions: If we hold ourselves aloof, as good scientists ought to do, from the regression to magic, from compromising and juggling, from obscuring the issue in order to do some fishing in troubled waters, then we are bound to admit that we are just beginners — or pioneers, to use a softer term. After having given up the vainglorious attitude of the miracle worker we find that we are far from achieving what we want and ought to do. There is still a long struggle ahead of us till we become as free from pre-scientific bias as the other natural sciences. Yet we must fight our own battles without imitating their advanced methods and trying to speak their more perfected language. Our problems are of a different order and demand their own proper methods and their expression by independent terms. All of these we have got to develop.

As for the practical issue which for the therapist is the beginning and end of everything: We must never forget that we meet our patients' real and ultimate wishes empty handed. We may be able after a careful, painful and difficult study of his personality to show him when and where and why he has turned the wrong corner and to point out to him the right direction for his search after happiness. With great good luck we can set his feet on the right way. But we cannot go with him as his guide and companion on this way till he actually reaches the gates of happiness.

—
ected
by
fore
son
ural
the
air
with
who
act
—
at's

ists
and
g in
just
ven
hat
ere
ore-
our
ing
dif-
their
to

the
we
We
his
ned
for
his
ide
of

CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE

Isador H. Coriat:
A Note on the Medusa Symbolism

Efraim M. Rosenzweig:
Surrealism as Symptom

Sandor Feldman:
The Blessing of the Kohenites

Caroline Wijsenbeek:
Marcel Proust

Christine Olden:
**About the Fascinating Effect of the Narcissistic
Personality**

Hanns Sachs:
Psychotherapy and the Pursuit of Happiness

**Please use the order-postcard for renewing your
subscription.**

The publication of Vol. III of the *American Imago* will coincide with the calendar year 1942. It will consist of four issues, containing approximately 400 pages. Price of subscription \$5 (five dollars).

All manuscripts, editorial and business correspondence, payments by check or otherwise, should be addressed to the managing editor:

Dr. Hanns Sachs
168 Marlborough Street
Boston, Mass.

